

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLIV

MARCH, 1946

NO. 999

## *Aid to Youth in the World Crisis*

*(Quemadmodum)*

ENCYCLICAL LETTER

OF OUR HOLY FATHER, BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE, POPE PIUS XII  
TO THE VENERABLE BRETHREN: THE PATRIARCHS, ARCHBISHOPS,  
BISHOPS AND OTHER ORDINARIES HAVING PEACE AND COMMUNION  
WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

WHILE the terrible war raged We used all Our powers of persuasion and appeal to bring to a speedy end a conflict which had lasted all too long and to secure an agreement guaranteeing justice, equity and right. The same way now that fighting has ceased, but peace has not yet been restored, in virtue of Our apostolic office, We are leaving nothing undone to provide timely relief for so many ills and all possible comfort for the accumulated miseries that weigh on not a few nations. But of the almost countless ills born of the dire struggle none so hurts or so wounds Our paternal heart as that which involves a host of innocent children, millions of whom it is estimated are in many countries without the necessities of life and are suffering from cold, hunger and disease. Often, too, in their utter dereliction they feel the want not only of food, clothes and shelter but also of the affection which their tender years so need.

As you know, Venerable Brethren, We have done all that We could

to solve this problem. And We gladly take this occasion to express Our sincerest gratitude to those through whose liberality We have been able to alleviate somewhat the need of these infants and children. We know, too, that many have individually or as members of societies and organizations undertaken to help or are already actively at work. To these, worthy of all praise as they are, We pay due tribute and pray God to bless their activities, their plans for the future, their achievements.

But since help of this kind is entirely inadequate to the immense task, We have deemed it Our duty to turn to you and paternally urge you to take to heart the extremely grave plight of these needy children, leaving nothing undone that may contribute to ease their lot and bring relief.

We ordain, therefore, that in each of your dioceses you assign a day on which public prayers will be offered to appease God's anger and on which through your priests you will admonish the faithful of this urgent need and exhort them to support by their prayers, good works and offerings every movement that is directing its forces fully and effectively for the succor of needy and abandoned children.

#### PROBLEM OF ALL

This is a problem, of course, which touches all citizens, whatever be their views, if only their hearts respond to the appeals of nature and religion. But it belongs, in a special sense, to Christians who should see stamped on these poor destitute little brothers the image of the Divine Child and who are bound to heed those words: "Amen I say to you, as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me" (Matt. 25, 40).

Let all remember and reflect that these children will be pillars of the next generation and that it is essential that they grow up healthy in mind and body if we are to avoid a race infected with sickness and vice. Nobody should hesitate, then, to contribute time and money to a cause so opportune and essential. Those who are themselves less wealthy should give what they can with open hand and willing heart. Those who live in luxury should reflect and remember that the indigence, hunger and nakedness of these children will constitute a grave and severe indictment of them before God, the Father of mercies, if they harden their hearts and do not contribute generously. All, finally, should be convinced that their liberality will not be loss but gain, for we can safely say that one who gives from his means to the poor is lending to God Who, in His own time, will repay his generosity with abundant interest.

## PRAYERS AND MATERIAL AID

We firmly trust that, as in Apostolic times, when the Christian population of Jerusalem was subjected to poverty and persecution, the rest of the faithful throughout the world contributed their prayers and material aid (*Cf.* I Cor. 16, 1) so now, too, all will be inspired and animated by the same charity and will help as much as they can. This they should do, as We have said, especially by fervent prayer to our most merciful Redeemer. For, as you know, fervent prayer carries with it a mystic power that penetrates Heaven and calls down supernatural light and Divine impulses to illumine men's minds and incline their wills to good, to persuade and move them to charity.

Let us recall that in every age the Church has exercised the most diligent care of the young and has rightly deemed this as an official mission assigned in a very special way to her charity. And as she did this and continues to do it, she undoubtedly was following in the footsteps and obeying the injunctions of her Divine Founder, Who, gently gathering the children around Him, said to the Apostles who rebuked their mothers: "Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for of such is the kingdom of God" (Mark 10, 14). For Christ, as Our predecessor of immortal memory, Leo the Great, very well says, "Loves childhood which He had first assumed in mind and body. Christ loves childhood, the school of humility, the norm of innocence, the model of meekness. Christ loves childhood towards which He directs morality, to which He leads back the old age of men. Those whom He calls to His eternal kingdom above He inspires to follow His example" (Serm. XXXVII C. 3, ML 54, 258 C).

In the light of such words and sentiments, Venerable Brethren, you see with what love, diligence and care the Church looks after infants and children following the lead of her Founder. While she exercises all possible care to see that they be provided with food, shelter and clothing for their bodies, she does not ignore or neglect their souls which—born, so to speak, from the breath of God—seem to portray the radiant beauty of Heaven. Her first care and endeavor is, then, to preserve their innocence from stain and provide for their eternal salvation.

Accordingly, there are numberless institutions and organizations to educate the young, form them to solid virtue, and satisfy their needs in education as they grow in mind and body. In this important field, as you know, many Religious Orders and congregations of men and women are laboring with admirable zeal and effect, and their prudent, alert,

devoted activity is making a magnificent contribution to the progress of Church and State. This is being done not only in civilized countries, with large and excellent results, but also among uncultured peoples or those which the light of Christian truth has not yet reached, where missionary endeavor and, especially, the Pontifical Society of the Holy Childhood, rescues so many children and infants from the slavery of the devil and of wicked men, procuring for them the freedom of the children of God, and trains them to be members of civilized society.

#### STARVING AND HOMELESS

But at this tragic moment of history, when—alas—material and spiritual ruins are piled high, these providential charitable enterprises, which, perhaps, seemed capable of dealing with normal needs of this kind, are certainly inadequate. For, Venerable Brethren, We almost seem to see with Our own eyes the vast hosts of children weakened or at death's door through starvation. They hold out their little hands asking for bread "and there is no one to break it unto them" (Lam. 4, 4). Without home, without clothing, they shiver in the winter cold and die. And there are no fathers or mothers to warm and clothe them. Ailing, or even in the last stages of consumption, they are without the necessary medicines and medical care. We see them, too, passing before Our sorrowful gaze, wandering through the noisy city streets, reduced to unemployment and moral corruption, or drifting as vagrants uncertainly about the cities, the towns, the countryside, while no one—alas—provides safe refuge for them against want, vice and crime.

How, then, can We desist, Venerable Brethren, when We love those children of Ours so intensely in the heart of Jesus Christ (Philip 1, 8), how can We desist from appealing again and again to you all individually and collectively and to all throughout the world who, like you, are inspired with a sense of mercy and piety, so that the full force of Christian charity—and it is a mighty force—may be pooled by willing and generous souls in order to mitigate and relieve their piteous condition.

#### SEEK EFFECTIVE REMEDY

Let us use all the means that modern progress offers or recommends. Let new methods be devised which may, through the cooperation of all, provide an effective remedy for present ills and for those which are feared in the future. Thus, may it speedily come about that with God's help and inspiration the snares of vice, which hold so many derelict chil-



dren as an easy prey, may give way to the attraction of a virtuous life; that their blank idleness and gloomy sloth may give way to honest and cheerful employment; that for their hunger, starvation and nakedness they may have adequate relief from the Divine charity of Jesus Christ, which should be most alive, eager and strong among His followers at a time like this.

Such a change will contribute most effectively not only to the increase of the Catholic Religion and of Christian virtue but also to the good of the human family at large and of civil society. For, as all know, there would not be such a mass of delinquents in the common jails if greater and more suitable measures were taken to prevent especially juvenile delinquency. And if everywhere there grew up a healthy, honest and industrious youth, it would be easier to find citizens remarkable for their probity, fortitude and other mental and physical qualities.

This was Our purpose, Venerable Brethren, in writing to you this Encyclical about so grave a question, committing to you the task of communicating Our paternal exhortation in the way you consider most suitable to your flocks. And We firmly trust that this, Our exhortation and appeal, will meet with a ready answer from all and with generous contributions and collaboration.

Inspired by this hope, as a pledge of heavenly graces and a sign of Our special benevolence with all affection in the Lord, We impart the Apostolic Benediction to you all, Venerable Brethren, to the flocks committed to your care, and especially to those who have already, in any way, served this cause and to those who will serve it in the future.

Given at St. Peter's, Rome, on the 6th day of January, Feast of the Epiphany of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the year 1946, the seventh of Our Pontificate.



### *Disarmament and Peace*

Conclusions of peace which failed to attribute fundamental importance to disarmament, mutually accepted, organic and progressive both in letter and spirit, and failed to carry out this disarmament loyally, would sooner or later reveal their inconsistency and lack of vitality.—*Pope Pius XII, Christmas, 1939.*

## Sharing the Cross

Reprinted from *The TRIBUNE*\*

THE season of Lent has begun again with the ancient traditional rites which the Catholic Church prescribes. Priests placed a cross of ashes on the foreheads of the people, as a symbol of penance, and a reminder of the end towards which the life of every human being moves. "*Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return.*" Such is the fruit of sin in our fallen nature—though, thanks to the Cross of Christ, the sentence of death is not a final one for those who turn to Him in faith and love. "*I am the Resurrection and the Life; if a man believes in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. . . .*"

If, however, we would live in Christ, St. Paul explains, we must be partakers also of His death—our incorporation as members in His Mystical Body involves a sharing in the Crucifixion, voluntarily accepted. The price of discipleship is stated very simply by Our Blessed Lord Himself: "*If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his Cross and follow Me.*" This is not exactly a popular doctrine at the present time. We are frequently given the impression that the chief aim of Christian action should

be to make social life as pleasant as possible for everyone—that the real "Kingdom of God" is an earthly Utopia of well-being and abundance, and the quest for personal sanctification and Eternal Life is a matter of quite secondary importance. With such views commonly current, it is not surprising that Christianity is often pronounced to have "failed," since, in two thousand years, it has not produced anything resembling the New Jerusalem of H. G. Wells.

But success of this kind was never promised by Our Lord, or sought by those who preached the Gospel. The Marxists have been far more clear-headed than most of their modernist Christian sympathizers in realizing this fact. They have set up *their* Utopian creed in avowed and violent opposition to the Faith, and have quite logically proclaimed religious beliefs and objectives to be delusions whose destruction is essential, so that they may no longer divert human energy into fruitless activities.

Christ promised that His Church would grow "like a mustard tree"—and it has so grown; that His message would be a sign of contradiction—as it has ever been. Finally, he gave warning that those who follow-

\* 312 Lonsdale St., Melbourne, C. 1., Australia, Feb. 24, 1944.

ed Him truly would be persecuted and suffer many griefs, and that their life would be a constant warfare. In exchange for these burdens, He offered them everlasting Life, and, even in this storm-tossed present world, a peace and joy of which no man could deprive them. Those who are best qualified to speak, since they have dedicated their lives most completely to Him, are unanimous in their acknowledgment that the earthly gift has been granted, and in their confidence that the heavenly one will not be denied.

#### SPIRIT OF LOVE

No doubt, if any community were to be imbued, in a thorough sense, with the Christian spirit of love, its "standard of living" would be improved in every way, including that of material well-being. Such a community would fight successfully against the inhuman conditions of life which bring moral degradation in their train, and would put an end to slavery and oppression for the sake of the soul of the master as well as that of the worker. We may be certain, however, that it would not be secured by the worship of material comfort for its own sake which obsesses our secular reformers. If, like Christ Himself, it worked at the healing of the sick in body and soul, it would also accept, as He did, the fact of suffering, and its necessity for the perfecting of the

human soul; so that, as the external pressure of misery was lifted, the voluntary practice of asceticism and self-denial would grow ever more intense. If it failed in this, it would soon cease to be Christian at all, and its whole way of life would be corrupted.

Actually, the chief "failure" of Christians—not of Christianity—lies in the refusal, from age to age, of all but a few to accept the invitation of Our Lord to embrace the Cross. The social pattern of secularism, to-day, makes it difficult for Catholics to carry out the rigorous fasts and penances of Lent which were normal in earlier ages, so that the law has been relaxed for the sake of our weakness. But do we ever ask *why* this new situation has arisen? Clearly because the Faith "lost its grip" on the world through a defect of zeal. It was undermined from within before being dethroned, and forced to exist in the conditions imposed upon it by a secularist system; and this was possible because the true spirit of the Cross had weakened: with prosperity and wealth had come "*conformity to the world.*"

If we are to reverse this situation in the world of our children, or even keep the flame of Faith alive in the terrible anti-Christian wind which is rising in our time, we must be vividly in earnest about this business of "dying in Christ" and detaching ourselves from the obsession with world-

ly interests, comforts and pleasures. The fact that the fasting laws of the Church have been of necessity relaxed both in their rigor and their application should not lead us to imagine that the obligation to "*do penance, or perish*" has ceased to apply to our personal lives. We have to live as Christians in a world where firm belief, and a grip of supernatural reality, are incomparably more difficult than they have ever been—which means that we must become "athletes of Christ" of the calibre of the men and women of the early Church; ready, if necessary, to meet every kind of test, even that of martyrdom; determined, in face of the appalling odds against us, to carry on victoriously the apostolate to which we are called.

The practice of mortification is

essential, then—*first*, to secure the grace of mastery over our own souls, so that we may offer them whole and entire to Our Lord; *secondly*, so that our penance may do something to atone for the awful guilt and blasphemy of the Christian world which has rejected Him, as Judah did of old; and, *thirdly*, so that the Cross may be set up in the sight of the new pagans, as it was in that of the ancient Roman world. Let us be generous in our sacrifices this Lent—not hesitating to choose those which are "costing" to our weakness; generous, too, in our positive devotions—prayers, Masses and alms-deeds. So shall we fortify our own souls as a strong dwelling-place of the Spirit, and do our part in the battle against the tyranny of things which lays waste the lives of men.



### *Pray Always*

Yes, there may be little time to go into a church and pray formally, but prayer is not dependent on time and place. You can pray anywhere, anytime. Your whole day can be one long prayer—and the night too; waiting for a streetcar, doing the housework, typing a letter, taking dictation, studying, golfing, bowling, even sleeping; everything can be a beautiful prayer, if each action is offered up to God and done in His Name. It can be a missionary prayer, if it is offered to God on behalf of pagan souls.—*Rev. Thomas L. Murphy, in The FAR EAST, Nov., 1945.*

# Labor and the Common Good

MOST REV. JAMES A. GRIFFIN, D.D.

I STAND here before you, delegates of the Illinois Federation of Labor, in a double capacity. My sentiments, therefore, shall bear the character, not only of my deep personal concern in the Christian cause of social justice, but, because of the office I hold, they shall likewise delineate the attitude of my Church toward the critical issues that face you today. Speaking to you, therefore, as private citizen and as prelate, I pray God that I fail in neither respect.

The keynote of this convention, emphasizing as it does the harmony that should prevail between management and labor, calls to mind—on this brisk autumn morning—a metaphor, sketched in the parlance of football. Let us, for a moment, envision a football team with a strong backfield and an equally powerful line. Imagine the invincible exhibition this aggregation could put forth, if both backfield and line did their share of blocking, did their share of smothering the opposition in its tracks, and, when the victory was attained, shared proportionately in the compensation thereof!

Imagine, on the contrary, the ignominious set-backs of such a team if the backfield were given first-rate

*Address delivered by the Bishop of Springfield at the opening of the State Convention of the Illinois Federation of Labor, Springfield, Illinois, October 29, 1945.*

equipment, while the line was handed out an odd assortment of 1920 shoulder pads and old tennis shoes, if the backfield refused to support the line, if the line was constantly bickering with the backfield, refusing to block for it and deliberately missing easy tackles.

You have to have teamwork to win a football game—and you must have teamwork to settle the problems of our modern social order! Unless management and labor get down to some real, self-sacrificing, mutual teamwork, the opposition—unemployment, depression, bread-lines and economic collapse—will most assuredly win the day. This must not happen again!

## INDUSTRY AT THE CROSSROADS

American industry has come to the crossroads, and only the intellectually myopic refuse to admit it. The massing forces of organized labor, uniting as never before, are voicing by concerted action the plea of the working man for social justice. Ladies and gentlemen, the voice of American

labor will be heard! Those glib propagandists of a decadent social era, with tired accents, still harp with deceptive rhetoric on the old theme that "free competition is an American heritage." They forget, however—or perhaps they never knew—that there is as much difference between "free" competition and "unlicensed" competition, as there is between "freedom of expression" and "libel." When an employer uses his right of "free competition" to the unjust oppression of his employee, he stands just as guilty before the bar of Divine Justice as does a man who bears false witness against his neighbor.

That labor will achieve its rightful place in the economic pattern of peace-time America is a foregone conclusion. It is, to borrow a phrase from Edna St. Vincent Millay, as inevitable as a bomb that has already been dropped from an airplane. The aims of organized labor, however, can only be achieved in one of two ways: first, by a meeting of industrial minds, of employer and employed, and the consequent working-out of a mutual program equitable to both; or, second, by Government control! The former is consonant with Democracy, the latter fastens the inexorable padlock of Socialism. Which shall it be? Shall it be a nation-wide agreement of occupational groups of all types of industry, fixing their own wage scales, working hours, and closed-shop contracts—or shall it be

more uncomfortable rides in the arms of ejecting soldiers by dispossessed and disgruntled executives? The answer lies with capital and labor. The time has come to make your decision!

Organized labor has gathered too much momentum to be stopped by ineffective headlines in prejudiced newspapers, or by truculent attempts to resurrect unfair employment practices, such as the "yellow dog" contract. The sooner the leaders of American industrial management decide—on all fronts—to sit down and talk things over with conscientious representatives of organized labor, the sooner will Henry Wallace's symbolic goal of sixty million jobs become a reality!

#### SELF-IMPOSED ECONOMIC SLAVERY

In conference with several arbitration board officials, I have also learned that there is another side of the picture. Therefore, let me issue this warning to you, members of the Illinois Federation of Labor. Organized labor has been given a definite black-eye—and I'm not so sure that some of it wasn't deserved—by the presence in labor's ranks of profiteering labor organizers, of graft-tainted walking delegates, of out-and-out racketeers. That's why, a moment ago, I said that social justice will be obtained by open and above-board discussions between management and conscientious representatives of labor. A word to the wise is sufficient!

Some future—let us say—inter-planetary historian might well look with incredible wonder on the blundering efforts of human-kind to work out its material destiny on an earth over which it enjoyed unchallenged mastery. Man, made the very lord of creation, he who in turn harnessed the power of streams, retrieved with his engineering skill the buried mineral wealth of his planet, he who but recently imprisoned within a relatively small implement of warfare, the cosmic fury of the sun itself—man, we might say, will remain an enigma to all the universe because of his stupid submission to and degrading enslavement by social and economic forces of his own fabrication.

Man, in his laudable efforts to assert his own prowess, allowed his personal greed and selfish ambition, due in part to the perversity of his fallen nature, to exploit his less fortunately endowed fellow man. This gave rise to a social structure founded on uncontrolled individualism, which has for centuries completely disregarded the natural and positive laws of justice, robbed the workingman of fair compensation, decent hours and working conditions, and ruthlessly despoiled him of his full human dignity as well.

Two men in the nineteenth century looked with compassion on this unworthy spectacle of millions upon millions of men no more the masters

of their own material welfare than were the galley-slaves of ancient tyrants. One of these men was Karl Marx, whose treatise *Das Kapital* nurtured a social system that has boomeranged into one of the most oppressive forms of human slavery ever witnessed in the Christian era. The other was Pope Leo XIII, hailed by the secular press of his generation as "the Pope of the workingman," whose encyclical *Rerum Novarum* outlined the fundamental principles and the means of attaining wholesome and lasting Christian social justice.

#### COMMUNISM—SUICIDE FOR ORGANIZED LABOR

Rugged individualism and its siamese twin, unlicensed competition, must be outlawed once and for all. But, ladies and gentlemen of the Illinois Federation of Labor, there are only two antidotes at hand for these immoral cancers of our social tissue. The first antidote, Communism, has been revealed, in the light of history and present-day analysis, to be nothing more than a deft political transfer of uncontrolled individualism from the managing class—capital—to the government class—a brutal and totalitarian Red dictatorship. It is, in simple and stark-naked effect, the naive exhibition of a Communist dictator saying to the Russian workingman: "Here, don't let the bourgeoisie enslave you; let me do it instead!" There is neither the

time, nor do I consider it necessary, to belabor, point by point, the evidence brought forward by first-hand observers of the Russian scheme at work. If organized labor is looking for a particularly nasty way to commit suicide, I recommend Communism!

The second, and only effective, antidote for uncontrolled individualism is the Christian program of social justice, outlined by Pope Leo XIII, developed by Pope Pius XI in his great encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* written forty years later, and championed here in our own country by such eminent churchmen as Bishop Francis J. Haas and the late Monsignor John A. Ryan. At a time when all our economic forces are striving so desperately to make the transition from war-time to peace-time production, when, once again, suspicion and distrust are beginning to widen the fissure between capital and labor, I appeal to you representatives of organized labor to give this program an unbiased hearing. It is singularly remarkable, I might add, that there has never been a non-Catholic authority of any prominence in the field of labor—except, of course, the frantic disciples of Moscow—who has had anything but praise to extend to this program. That, in itself, is singularly indicative!

Naturally, I could never outline the whole plan of Christian social justice to you in a brief address. In

the few minutes remaining, however, I do wish to amplify one salient aspect of this program. Bishop Haas, with whose work you are all familiar, maintains that a well-balanced social structure will never be achieved until capital and labor realize that they are both bound, not only to respect the individual rights of one another, but a *third right* as well. As Bishop Haas points out:

Up to the present time the practice has been to think of only two parties as having an interest in any given employment contract—the worker and the employer. Pope Pius XI insists that three parties have a direct and immediate interest—the worker, the employer, and the general public. The addition of the third party is of paramount importance. It marks the difference between the acceptance and the rejection of the social character of the work. (1)

The general public! How often does consideration for the economic welfare of the whole people enter into the ordinary wage-contract? "True and genuine social order demands various members of society, joined together by a firm bond," wrote Pope Pius XI, "and such a bond is provided . . . by the common good which all groups should unite to promote." (2).

#### THE COMMON GOOD

What do we mean by the "public economic good"? Only too often, leaders of industry and representatives of organized labor betray an

<sup>1</sup> Haas: *The Wages and Hours of American Labor*.

<sup>2</sup> *Quadragesimo Anno*: 1931.



unpardonable nearsightedness regarding the common good. Business is understandably intent on safeguarding profits, labor on securing the highest possible wages. No one denies that "the wage paid to the workingman must be sufficient for the support of himself and of his family" (3). Neither, however, let us forget that "it is unjust to demand wages so high that an employer cannot pay them without ruin, and without consequent distress amongst the working people themselves" (4). But, apart from these two considerations, if a sound social and economic system is to be expected, "the size of the wage is to be adjusted to the common economic good" (5) as the Holy Father points out.

In other words, wages should be kept high enough to insure the laboring man a "certain modest fortune" after he has paid the necessary expenses of his daily life. At the same time, however, it is advised that an employment wage which is just and fair to both capital and labor be likewise determined upon, since unemployment is caused just as much by excessively high wages as by excessively low wages. When one union demands a wage so high that the employer is forced to curtail production personnel to meet this demand, doesn't this mean the elimina-

tion of just so many jobs that might otherwise have been filled by other workmen? And when an employer refuses to augment low wages from his profits, is it not an economic surety that he is thereby throttling the buying power of the community, which, by the inflexible law of supply and demand, will force the employer either to lower his prices—and hence his own profits—or to lay off more wage-earners—and thereby cut down the buying power of his potential consumers?

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF RESPECTING THE COMMON GOOD

Bishop Haas wisely cautions, with an eye on past events, that the common good must be respected if man is to extricate himself from the exigencies of "business cycles" or the alternating rise and fall of output and work. Equitable and just living wages, wages which today might demand a sacrifice on the part of employer and employe alike, provide the buying power of tomorrow. The question, however, naturally presents itself: how are we to determine what sort of a wage is to be paid which will assure the common good of all? Various factors enter the equation, not the least of which is the reduction of working hours without a reduction in wages. Then, too, management—with an eye to the public commonweal—must ascertain the extent to which it can raise—or

• Ibid.

• Ibid.

• Ibid.

the degree to which it might lower—a wage and still maintain a decent and stable profit. In short, management and labor must work this out together. Mutual distrust must go. Whereas capital must weed out unfair employment practices, labor must unhesitatingly jettison the union racketeer, who has done so much to influence public opinion against organized labor.

#### PROFIT, WAGES AND DEPRESSION

When this mutual distrust has been dispersed, then and then only can capital and labor join forces to better their own relations, and to promote the common good of *all* people, be they actually participating in person in the labor contract or not. For what good will come of temporary excessive profit if another depression is in the making? Or what good will come of temporary excessive wages if production is thereby stalled, causing wide-spread unemployment? Sacrifices on the part of both capital and labor *must* be made if we intend to work our tortuous way free of the economic chains with which we have fettered ourselves for generations. Conscious of the tremendous amount of good will, sacrifice and economic analysis that must precede the determination of this just, living wage—equitable both to capital and labor—in various occupational groups, I can only reiterate that, idealistic as it may sound, it is

the only way, apparently, to rescue the social community from this continual and harrowing experience of living a constant prey to fluctuating cycles, from boom to depression to boom and back again.

Now is the time to investigate and deliberate whether this wage demand or this strike or this jurisdictional dispute will aid or injure the common good of your community. That's what your chairman, Mr. Rodier, advocated when he said only a few months ago:

Labor after the war must prove to the American people that it is willing to invest its efforts and power only in a plan that will obtain the best returns to the advantage of all the people. . . . Labor must admit that it has duties to society as well as rights. . . . Labor must be organized. Labor must have power and use it wisely. The wisest use of power is for the common good. Organized Labor cannot afford to be in disrepute by the abuse of its power.<sup>6</sup>

And so, ladies and gentlemen of organized labor, I exhort you at the outset of your state convention, to ponder well upon your responsibility to the communities in which you live and work. Let a maximum of fair-play and brotherly love—and a minimum of selfishness—be your goal. The reconstruction of our peace-time social order is in your hands. And capable hands they are, too—hands that have been roughened with good hard work—and yet which are always open to help the fellow

<sup>6</sup> Illinois Building Trades' Reference Guide: 1942

that's down, millions of hands—the hands of the American workingman—forging plough-shares out of swords. In the capable hands of the patriotic American workingman rests the future of our country! And as a thousand lathes begin to turn in our many factories, and as the great muscles of steel interlock themselves to form the sinews of new buildings, as the noise of busy hammers and the bite of busy wrenches sound out over America at peace, remember, American workingman, remember that in your devotion to the common good of all men, you personify, in a very

meaningful way, another Workingman who labored with saw and plane two thousand years ago in Palestine. Live up to this Model, and all America in grateful tribute will paraphrase the sentiments of Joyce Kilmer when he said:

*O Carpenter of Nazareth,  
Whose mother was a village maid,  
Shall we, Thy children, blow our  
breath*

*In scorn on any humble trade?  
Have pity on our foolishness,  
And give us eyes that we may see  
Beneath the workman's humble dress,  
The splendor of humanity!*



### *Migrant Workers*

Inadequate labor standards are the chief obstacle to securing a labor supply in commercial agriculture. Migrant workers are the most depressed labor group in the United States. The limited number of migrant labor camps originally set up by the Farm Security Administration and now operated by the Labor Division of the Department of Agriculture have rendered real service in providing better housing conditions, better educational and health facilities and better recruitment practices. These camps have served as a demonstration in better housing and have stimulated growers to improve their labor camps for migrant workers.—*From a statement issued by Protestant, Catholic and Jewish religious organizations, December 13, 1945.*

## *The Task of University Catholics*

*Reprinted from THE TABLE\**

THE Pax Romana Congress which has just been held in London has shown the vitality of an organization which, linking together Catholic societies in the universities, has an immense part to play in the immediate future. The events which make the front-page news for one generation are the direct result, the realization in action, of thoughts and sentiments which have been harbored and accepted a generation before.

We are now living through the nemesis of what a lifetime ago looked comfortable and progressive and assured: the acceptance of materialism. It is the function of those who live in the world of the universities to busy themselves with the reinstatement of better and truer ideas as the guiding ideas of human life.

When Professor Laski advises Signor Nenni to introduce a completely secularized system of education in Italy, it is advice only to be expected from a former President of the Rationalist Press Association; anachronistic advice, perhaps excusable 200 years ago, in the first romantic flush of the Abbé de Saint-Pierre's cry, "What may not man hope to do, armed with geometry and the natural sciences!" There have been two centuries of the natural sciences since

then, and it is the moral sciences, and in particular theology, which need to be brought back and given their due place.

The ordinary Catholic, without the higher education, has, indeed, an obvious and widely-neglected duty to be more zealous to secure for the Church her essential freedom to teach, since what she has to teach is not only of transcendent importance in itself, but is of immense value as a preservative against excess; and men cannot afford any longer to indulge in the excess. The greater their powers of destruction in war, the more important it becomes that they shall accept interiorly a code and a discipline. The wise statesman, even though a skeptic himself, must wish today to see this great universal religion stronger and not weaker, and a real bond, in particular, between the people of the most highly industrialized countries. These Pax Romana Congresses, whenever they assemble, immediately demonstrate the reality of the bond, even in a moment of exacerbated national feeling. Here are men and women with a great deal in common.

Those who seek to diminish and depress this real, supranational body, the Catholic Church, may do so, as the Nazis did, or like Victorian English-

\* 128 Sloane Street, London, S.W. 1, England, Sept. 8, 1945

men or the Frenchmen of the Third Republic, in the interests of their own nationalism; or they may do it with the hope of spreading, as modern Socialists, an international Socialist feeling. If that is their calculation, they must recognize that they are living on hope, with experience against them; for hitherto it is the national feeling which has always proved immediately and vastly stronger than international Socialism. Whatever the arrogant calculation, the fact remains that, in a world which needs bonds of unity more than it needs anything else, men still come forward proclaiming themselves specially wedded and dedicated to peace between the peoples, and then seek to undermine everywhere the influence and prestige of the one great institution which has lived through the period of intense nationalism, and, often submerged, has always survived.

#### ATTITUDE TO THE CHURCH

The ordinary Catholic should consider it a part of his good citizenship, as well as part of his loyalty to his religion, to make his support of any political party conditional upon its attitude to the Church. The Church is the institutional embodiment of a universal religion which, as it is open to all men, so it proclaims and fortifies their brotherhood. Yet we have only to look in our own country to see how indifferently this duty is performed. We agree with the correspondents who write to us about the at-

titude of the large Catholic population in the north of England. When Mr. Ivor Thomas, now a junior Minister, visited the Vatican a few weeks ago, he assured the Holy See that four out of five British Catholics support the Labor Party. His estimate, which is probably pretty accurate, was noted at the Vatican, where it was taken for granted that the Catholics and their leaders, in the north of England or the south of Scotland, would not give Catholic support to a party whose influence would anywhere be hostile to the rights and liberties of the Church.

We do not think that Mr. Attlee's Government is, in fact, likely to prove hostile, because there was never a time since the Reformation when British and Catholic interests more closely coincided. The world-wide religious institution and the world-wide commercial Empire have the same interest in peace, in constitutionalism, in religious, political and economic freedom. But, as compared with Government policy, how different is the picture when we look at the ideology now so dominant in the Labor movement; at the intellectuals and the Left Wing Press; at the way the northern Catholic electorate gives its support meekly, does not ask or expect to have its susceptibilities taken into account, and so is assumed to care much more about the success of Socialists abroad, however anti-Catholic, than about what will happen to the Church. The only concession is that

the Church is so far as possible left out of the picture, not mentioned when the politics of Italy, France, Spain or Portugal are discussed and presented in purely economic terms. Catholics are not asked by the Church to limit their freedom of choice between parties other than the Communist; they can be as eager for or against nationalization as they please; but they are expected, inside each party, to show a certain zeal for the vital interests of their co-religionists in other countries.

For the forthcoming Italian elections, the Consistorial Congregation has given a directive to the Italian Catholics with this consideration prominent in their minds, that the candidates or parties they support must promise to respect the rights of the Church. Those rights, like the right to provide Catholic education for the children of Catholics, and to live the full religious life of the Church, not only with freedom of worship but with freedom for the religious Orders, are rights which every civilized country granting liberty has no difficulty in maintaining. Where they are assailed, as they constantly are, it is because anti-Christian politicians themselves want to educate the young; Stalin in one way, as Hitler in another, or Professor Laski in a third.

If this is the duty of the ordinary Catholic elector everywhere, not to let himself be brow-beaten by shouts

of "Fascist" or "reactionary" when he speaks about these rights, the duty of the educated University Catholic goes much further. If it is not right for States to dictate the formation of the young, still less should the State control the universities, as it has been their increasing tendency everywhere to do. Those who meet at Pax Romana Congresses, first in this country and then in that, are witnessing to two things: to the universality of the Church, but also to the re-assertion of the international status of the universities, for higher education should know no frontiers. The universities themselves arose in Europe at a time when men, sharing everywhere the same religion, would have been as surprised at the idea of Governments controlling universities as modern men would be if Urban District Councils sought to lay down what they should learn.

It is in the world of universities freed from local political control that we may hope to see the movement start which will recall men back to the true lines of their development. The primacy of religion has to be re-discovered by the modern world, and men must realize that they are not here dealing with a subjective matter of taste, something which is all right if it interests them, one subject among many, one hobby among many. Dr. Mandell Creighton put the point very well, a lifetime ago, at a time when this subjective mentality was being so

sedulously spread, at Oxford and Cambridge and in the public schools, by men in holy orders of his own communion, whose dominant idea was to show themselves broadminded and up-to-date. The common idea, he said, seems to be that you shall read as you please, think and do what you like, and then, with a mind and character so conditioned, turn your attention to the Christian religion, and say "It does not appeal to *me*; how could it?"

#### LOSS OF PROPORTION

What he wrote of the individual is really true of modern society, which is in a state of auto-intoxication with its own sustained distractions. When far more men devote themselves to acquiring riches than to following out the Christian revelation, the physical result of this arbitrary act of choice is the vast modern commercial cities; which then overpower the imagination of the next generation, until they are hypnotized into thinking that economic activity is the real thing against which the claims made for religion must be tested and judged.

Other men concentrate, generation by generation, on building up the power of a State, perfecting its armies and public services, its dignity and all the devices by which its authority

can be impressed on the imagination of those who are to obey it. They succeed, until the society they have thus elaborated and decorated seems the real and proper object of devotion, physically present and all-pervasive; and again the truth is obscured, that all this great result, which is summed up in the name of this or that country, is the result of human acts of the will, of free choice in the past; something contingent, the result of pushing and concentrating on certain directions and letting other things atrophy or subsist as best they can on a far leaner diet of human devotion and energy.

Europe is a particularly tragic story because in country after country men began in their first centuries as Christians with their proportions right, lavishing honor on the offices of the Church, making their greatest buildings the place where Mass was to be offered, that the eye should be assisted, and that the imagination should not have violently to readjust itself, as with modern believers it has to do, with the perpetual modern contrast between the real and apparent importance of different human activities. The history of Europe has been the story of the loss of that proportion, and the business of Europe now is to recover it.



# Handmaid of the Liturgy

FRANCIS J. GUENTNER, S.J.

*Reprinted from LITURGICAL ARTS\**

THE rich heritage of the liturgy of the Church was not an inheritance bequeathed overnight. While the militant Christians of the early centuries were suffering the persecutions of the swiftly disintegrating empire, the liturgy was steadily developing. And when the Edict of Milan was given to the Roman world in 313, the Church found itself "officially" free to develop and spread to all nations, as Christ had told it to do. It was principally then that the liturgical arts became an organic factor, developing simultaneously with the liturgy itself. Music, poetry and architecture advanced with great strides as planechant, hymnody and the basilicas took their part in the liturgical life of the Church. The beginnings of sacred painting seem, according to our standards, rather crude, but they served their purpose well, and gradually prepared the way for the magnificent creations of the late middle ages and early renaissance, just as the early attempts at polyphony resulted finally in the golden age of Flemish, Roman and Spanish composers of the renaissance.

The history of the Christian era has shown, however, that when the Church's mission is impeded, all the liturgical arts are generally kept from

real progress. And thus, as a result of the greatest mistake in modern times, the Protestant revolution, not only was the progress of the liturgical arts practically stopped, but their very purpose was lost to sight. The withdrawal from spiritual government by a divinely instituted authority, the adoption of private interpretation of Scripture, the overthrowing of religious practices in general—all furthered the more complete secularization of life. And the result in the world of art was a similar secularization, for the common religious themes were passed over in favor of subjects of purely natural interest. A particularly interesting turn took place in music. The progress made in the development of the opera style, the greater possibilities of the chromatic scales, the rising interest in orchestra opened up realms hitherto unexplored. Many churchmen of the time, being zealous in furthering the cause of the arts, and in spreading appreciation of them, readily adopted the new developments, gave them a part in the performance of the liturgy, and in time did not hesitate to change and subordinate the liturgy if it seemed necessary or convenient.

The decadence of planechant, it is

\* 7 E. 42nd St., New York 17, N. Y., August, 1945



true, had begun in Northern Europe as early as the thirteenth century when measured music began to appear, numerous tropes were inserted, and the interpretation of the *melismata* became uncertain. Nevertheless even in its decadent form Gregorian chant was recognized as the music of the Church, and did not lose its official status in spite of the great part that polyphony took in the performance of the liturgical functions in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. During the renaissance the disfiguration of the old chant had become complete, and its degradation no less complete. The reformers, and especially Luther, who had been trained in the traditions of the Church, recognized this, and consequently rejected much of the florid and melismatic chant, but retained many of the simpler melodies and replaced the Latin words by words in the vernacular.

In order to meet this particular menace, the fathers of the Council of Trent, in a celebrated decree on necessary reforms connected with the celebration of holy mass, enjoined upon the bishops the task of "purifying" the music, of banishing from their churches all those kinds of music in which there was mixed up anything indecorous or improper. Pope Gregory XIII thereupon undertook to carry through a revision of the old

chant books. The work, assigned to a number of leading Church musicians, among them Palestrina, was dropped because of insufficient knowledge of the principles of chant and the lack of original sources. The task was reassigned to Suriano and Anerio, however, and when the edition was finally issued in 1614-15 by the famous Medicean presses of Florence, it was found to be marred by almost numberless errors. For all that it passed publicly as the authentic text of the chants until the second half of the nineteenth century.

But such interest in the chant as had been created by the appearance of the *Editio Medicea* was only a passing stir. As the seventeenth century progressed, both chant and polyphony were being replaced by music composed in the contemporary idiom, but clothed in the guise of the liturgical texts. It is not our purpose here to go into details, showing how individual composers went astray in their endeavors to supply music for the Church. A mistake so universal could come from no other source than an incorrect principle. The erroneous judgment in this case was a misunderstanding of the purpose of liturgical art: and the result was often merely a display of grandiose effort and personal skill which tried vainly to cover over an inner emptiness and lack of meaning.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> "The demand of truth is made upon church music in the name of art. Aesthetics demand truth, not a false sentimentalism that is chaotic in its joys and sorrows." Dom Virgil Michel in his *The Liturgy of the Church*, New York, 1938. Macmillan.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, rococo art was accepted as the genuine expression of the liturgy. As Father Robert Brennan has said so well, Catholics had developed the habit of taking these things for granted, had developed the habit of holding on blindly to associations, of being affected more intimately by the sentimental than the intellectual.<sup>2</sup>

#### MOTU PROPRIO OF PIUS X

Finally in 1903, when the work of the Solesmes monks in restoring Gregorian chant and the Ratisbon churchmen in republishing polyphony had shown the world what the Christian heritage in sacred music was, Pope Pius X issued his *Motu Proprio*, a proclamation to return to the Church's correct and high liturgical standards. The immediate objective of this famous document was to recall to mind the nature and purpose of sacred music used as part of the sacred services. The Pope surely realized that though he was not introducing anything new, his instruction would none the less be considered an innovation by many. That he considered the reform of absolute necessity is shown by the fact

that he had not been in office half a year when the decree was issued. No doubt he foresaw that criticism would arise to interfere with the restitution he held so important. May not this have been the reason why he included the words, "We do therefore publish . . . with *certain knowledge* Our present instruction"?

The Church as a temple of worship is no more a concert hall than it is an art gallery. It is a house of prayer and sacrifice, and particularly during the sacred functions themselves the music must be a worthy component of the unbloody sacrifice. The action which takes place in the sanctuary should be furthered or emphasized by the music of the choir; it should not be impeded or distracted. Of its nature liturgical music must be sacred, and because of its purpose it must be directed to something beyond itself; it cannot, in other words, be an *ars gratia artis*.<sup>3</sup> These facts are to us self-evident. They are the fundamental principles first to be considered in the judging of any art that poses as liturgical. But it was these very principles that Pius X had to bring to the attention of the world in 1903.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> In his paper, "Chant and the Laity," read at the Third Liturgical Week, held at Saint Meinrad's in October, 1942.

<sup>3</sup> "In general it must be considered to be a very grave abuse when the liturgy in ecclesiastical functions is made to appear secondary to and in a manner at the service of the music, for the music is merely a part of the liturgy and its humble handmaid." *Motu Proprio*, paragraph 23.

<sup>4</sup> "Sacred music, being a complementary part of the solemn liturgy, participates in the general scope of the liturgy, which is the glory of God and the sanctification and edification of the faithful. It contributes to the decorum and splendor of the ecclesiastical ceremonies, and since its principal office is to clothe with suitable melody the liturgical text proposed for the understanding of the faithful, its proper aim is to add greater efficacy to the text in order that through it the faithful may be the more easily moved to devotion . . ." *Motu Proprio*, paragraph 1.

As was to be expected, the traditions of the Church were appealed to in order to find some standard, some common ground by which good and bad Church music could be judged. And Gregorian chant was evidently the model naturally suited for this purpose. Classical polyphony, one of the many outflowerings of the middle ages, was then ranged next to the chant as the model of choral part music.

#### SACRED MUSIC

By placing these models as universal standards, the Pontiff showed that the matter of sacred music cannot lightly be passed over by saying that it is all merely a question of taste, either national or personal. The composers of chant and polyphony all met in a common system or tonality—the diatonic modes—and though the temperament of English and Spanish composers, for instance, was quite distinct, and hence their compositions reflected different emotional experiences which arose when the text was conceived musically, still the spirit and tone of the modal system, so rigidly adhered to, lent themselves admirably to the concept of sacred music, no matter what the nationality of the composer. And since the possibility of instruments to act as accompaniment was not even considered until late in the renaissance, the voice and what the

voices proclaimed were given the entire attention of the composer. There was therefore less chance for delay in the services, and also less opportunity for subordinating the liturgy to the music. It is not necessary that modern composers revert to modal system, but modern Church music must try to capture the spirit of the traditional models. This is the more difficult because "modern music has risen mainly to serve profane uses," and has found its natural home in the theatre, concert hall, and the like.

The legislation of Pius X has been repeated by succeeding popes until the present day. It is not difficult to see what the mind of the Church is concerning liturgical music. But since chant and polyphony have long been "out of vogue," and their spirit forgotten, not anyone according to his liking can be a competent judge of modern sacred music composed for the liturgy. A reorientation, a reeducation is necessary; and the progress made toward this reeducation in our own country has been great. If enthusiasm for correct Church music continues mounting with the speed shown in the past twenty years, we can rest assured that it will keep apace with the progress of the whole liturgical movement, which is one phase of Pius X's desire to restore all things in Christ.

## *Freedom of the Air*

*A Letter addressed to Mr. H. E. Fast, Manager of Station WKRC, Cincinnati, by the V. Rev. Msgr. Clarence G. Isenmann, S.T.D., Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Cincinnati.*

"My dear Mr. Fast:

"The Chancery has been informed that your Station indicated its willingness to have the dialogue address of Fathers Flanagan and Bertke, previously rejected by your management, go on the air Saturday afternoon, December 8, at 4:30 o'clock. This invitation could not be accepted for several reasons, one of which is that all our priests are engaged in pastoral duties on Saturday afternoon.

"Our report further informs us of your decision that Diocesan authorities should let your Station know when they 'are ready.' The meaning of the words 'are ready' is not clear to me.

"I think the public is entitled to a statement of facts as the Archdiocese views them.

"1. Arrangements were entered into between your Station and the Archdiocese of Cincinnati to give a series of dialogue addresses under the guiding caption of 'Catholic Position.' Fourteen priests were selected to give these addresses. Fathers Flanagan and Bertke were chosen to give three talks on the 'Rights of Labor.' This title was approved after your Station rejected our designation of 'The Right to Organize to Strike.'

"These two priests were concerned with basic principles. In no true sense could they be considered partisans. Their thought was to state clearly and simply the Catholic position.

"2. Your Station rejected the first address of these priests as controversial and excluded from the air their second and third addresses without even reading them, saying that 'the Station is not thinking of problems in religion as they are applied to social and economic theories.' The complete text of the address which your Station rejected is published in *The Telegraph-Register*, December 7th issue. I must deny that this address can be considered controversial by any disinterested person who knows the basic principles governing labor.

"3. In reversing your judgment about the rejected address of Fathers Flanagan and Bertke, you say nothing about allowing on the

air the second and third addresses of these priests on the rights of labor, which were integral parts of their statement. When the Archdiocese decided that it must discontinue the series of addresses by fourteen priests, it was obliged to do so in self-respect and in a sense of its responsibility to the public. It could not for an instant be a champion of freedom of radio and allow your Station to exclude from the air as controversial its statement of principles. It felt obliged to make a protest to the public.

"4. The press reports refer to the fact that these addresses were to be given on free time. There is the implication that the Station is the host and that the priest speakers are merely guests, who are not expected or even permitted to say anything objectionable to the host. Let me say that we priests are wholly at variance with the Station on the question of free time on the radio if it is to be understood in this sense.

"Our government is wisely insisting that radio stations allot a certain amount of free time to programs that will interest especially the general public. I am informed that many radio stations are not giving their full quota of free time. If time on the radio station be taken up entirely by commercial programs, it is obvious that commercial interests will control or slant these programs to their own interest. If this state of affairs comes about, we shall then have in the radio what we now have in the press—namely, entirely too much control by commercial and industrial interests, too much slanting of news stories in favor of management and capital, too much one point of view.

"5. Freedom of the press and freedom of the radio should mean the promotion of the general welfare of society. Those who have responsibility for the press and radio are charged with these social obligations, which they should discharge or make way for others who are willing to do so. Agencies in which the entire public has an interest cannot restrict themselves as merely commercial enterprises.

"6. I must remind your Station that the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati is an informed, responsible moral person. It is conservative and liberal in the true sense because it knows the profound meaning of moral principles. It is a far-seeing, constructive force, building for the future in the light of its knowledge of the past; it is a check on every dangerous and subversive movement. It does not regard the discharge of any of its duties, especially those to the general public, lightly. When it selected fourteen priests to give a series of addresses on subjects under the title, 'Catholic Position,' it wished to render a notable service to the listening radio area of Cincinnati; it sought to

avoid controversy by refraining from the expression of opinions; it recognized its serious social obligation.

"I must insist that there are no radical or communistic priests in the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. The words *radical* and *Communistic* have been used too frequently and too loosely in reference to the disagreement between the Station WKRC and the Archdiocese. Many of our priests have studied profoundly the basic moral principles ignored so generally today. Their study of these principles enables them to make a broad application to the vital questions of the hour in which the general public is greatly interested.

"In conclusion, the action of your management in deciding, in what seems to me a highhanded and arbitrary way, that the address of Fathers Flanagan and Bertke—which merely stated the moral position of the Catholic Church on the rights of labor—should not be permitted on the air, is a repudiation by your Station of true freedom of radio. Is it within the competency of a radio station to determine for itself what constitutes freedom of the radio?

"There is no thought of judging the motive of your management's decision, but it must be construed objectively as a grave insult to the Catholic Church of this locality. When your Station makes the offer to allow two priests to give an address over the air, which it previously rejected, or when it tells the Diocesan authorities to come to you when they 'are ready,' the Diocese must know what treatment it may expect. It is not willing to be subjected again publicly to further indignity.

"You may assure your management that the Archdiocese is most anxious to promote good will in the communities of its jurisdiction, never, however, at the sacrifice of principles."



### *Decent Housing*

We must have homes, not just houses. Consequently all houses should be healthy, roomy and warm. Each house should be equipped with a bathroom and at least three bedrooms. Considerations of privacy would seem to require two living rooms; and the proposal that in addition at least one of the bedrooms should be adaptable as a sitting-room during the day is highly commendable.—*Pastoral of the Scottish Hierarchy on Housing, January 1, 1946.*

## *Lights on the Land*

REV. W. J. FAHERTY, S.J.

*Reprinted from The MARIANIST\**

UNTIL two years ago when the need of volunteer harvest help brought me into an out-of-the-way rural area, I had never been in an unelectrified home. Like the average city-dweller, I had taken electricity so much for granted that I scarcely ever, if at all, considered life without it.

When I came in from work for the evening meal, the poor lighting made me feel as if I were back in the eighteen-seventies. The glare around the lamp contrasted sharply with the near-darkness of the room's corners.

I rejected a passing notion to page through a farmers' magazine because of the difficulty of reading. When we sat at table, the host faced the disturbing glare. The radio hid itself quietly in the corner since the battery needed recharging.

The busy housewife had perspired over a coal stove to prepare our meal. She had no electric appliances, no vacuum cleaner, no electric washer, no electric refrigerator,—things she could have purchased over a period of years since the farm was prosperous.

The farmer told me how electricity would cut down much of the drudgery of farm work. He could slash

away time used in milking, grind his own grain, saw firewood with a power cutter. He could erect temporary electric fences to pasture his cattle. He could instal yard lights to make his chores easier on winter evenings.

An electric pump would provide running water in the home and make possible the installation of an indoor sanitary system. The back-racking work of pumping water for stock would be eliminated.

### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Though the lack of electricity in this case was due to the out-of-the-way location of the farm, a similar condition existed in nine out of every ten farms in great and progressive United States in 1935. In fourteen States less than four out of every one hundred farms were served by electric lines. Not in Central Africa. No! In materially advanced Twentieth-Century America. But that was before "co-ops" entered the field of rural electrification.

In most areas of the country private power companies had by-passed the problem of spreading electric power among rural areas because the overhead was too high for adequate profit. In May, 1935 President Roosevelt

\* 108 Franklin St., Dayton 2, Ohio, October, 1945.



established the Rural Electrification Administration to bring electric power to American farms.

This agency was authorized to offer loans at low interest rates to finance line construction, generating plants and wiring for homes. These loans were not made to individuals but to groups. Most of them went to farmers' cooperatives organized for the purpose; the remainder to municipalities, public power districts and private power companies.

Since competition and the desire of high profits, so common in non-co-operative enterprises, were missing, electricity was available at low rates. A farmer of my acquaintance, for instance, received electricity from an REA Co-op at a minimum of \$3.00 and an average of \$5.00 per month. In contrast, ten miles from him lives another who pays a minimum of \$15.00 a month to a private power company—a rate beyond the range of the majority of American farmers. These examples are typical.

So popular was the movement and so rapidly did it grow, that by July, 1940 one out of every four farms in the country had electric service—the majority of it spread through REA cooperatives. Now after ten years of activity the REA reports almost half of America's farms electrified.

This development of Rural Electrification is only one of the ways in which "co-ops" are doing their part in giving rural America a face-lifting.

"Co-ops" have entered a great variety of fields from maternity wards to undertaking. Yes, Amherst, Texas, and Elkhart, Oklahoma, have their co-op hospitals, while Iowa has many burial societies.

#### CO-OPS AND WEALTH

"Co-ops" cut down the number of people handling a commodity. Thus the farmer can buy tools and machinery more cheaply and receive a higher price for his milk or grain.

By spreading the profits among patron members in proportion to their patronage, "co-ops" prevent excessive concentration of wealth. By the same process, they prevent money from flowing out of the community.

A co-op grain elevator in an Iowa town returned \$30,000 in rebates in the past two years to its 300 farmer-members. Think what that means in terms of added comfort for those farm families as well as added business for the town merchants.

The cooperative system allows farmers' groups to develop new businesses beyond the financial possibilities of any individual members. A co-op seed corn plant opened this spring in a Kansas community—a project surpassing the dream of any one man in the area.

To one unconvinced of the good "co-ops" have done and can do for rural America, let me invite you to take a look at neighboring mid-western towns. Both are on main-line



railroads; both in rich farming districts. For convenience we'll give them the nicknames of Hafen and Rister.

In the last five years only one young couple has settled on a farm near Hafen while twenty farm families have moved away. The beautiful Church is half full at Mass on Sunday with a few young children and a lot of old people. The town stores are shabby and run-down. The whole parish seems a shell.

Rister, on the other hand, has a well-kept look about it. The stores are thriving; its people forward-looking. The farms are evenly divided between young and old. Many of Rister's young people look forward to living on the farm. Most of them want to spend their lives in their own community.

What makes the difference? Un-

doubtedly many things. But people in the area share my opinion that the latter community's strong "co-op" is the deciding factor.

I am not advocating a complete change from the private profit system to the cooperative system. But as I have indicated a single "co-op" may raise the standards of a rural community.

"Co-ops" need not and should not conflict with well-run, locally owned private business enterprises in a rural community. Many new and neglected fields lie open for them to enter. Rural electrification was one such. There are many more.

Above all, the cooperative system must not remain merely another way of doing business. Cooperation must become a Way of Life. In those communities where it has become such, it has remade rural living.



### *Seed-bed of America*

The significance of the rural church for the future of America has often been pointed out but it was most graphically stamped on my mind by some figures compiled by O. E. Baker, of the University of Maryland. He said that if you started with 10 adults in the city, in three generations you would have  $3\frac{1}{2}$  left. But if you started with 10 adults in the country, in three generations you would have 28 persons. The inevitable conclusion is that the future of America depends upon the character of her rural population.—TOWN & COUNTRY CHURCH, November, 1945.

## Priests and Labor

MOST REV. JOHN T. McNICHOLAS  
*Archbishop of Cincinnati*

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC TELEGRAPH-REGISTER\**

EIGHT years ago 19 priests were selected to hold themselves in readiness to advise men who labor. The letter of appointment on that occasion stated that the 19 priests were entirely disinterested. The letter gave this directive: "They will accept no remuneration at any time for their services. They will in no way seek any personal advantage in the discharge of their duties. They will be ready whenever there is a violation of justice, if given the opportunity, to defend the laboring and poor man. Their services will be offered to all groups, regardless of creed, color, or race."

Wherever poor and laboring men are to be found, there priests should be. It is the duty of every priest to know the poor and to assist them. When the poor and laboring men ask for advice in matters of justice and morality, the priest has no choice but to render the best service of which he is capable. His life is dedicated to moral living, to religion, and to the virtues of justice and charity.

Our priests should know the conditions under which the poor live, and likewise the problems that they face and must try to solve. Our priests must be in touch with all groups of men who labor. They should know the privations, the difficulties, the hardships facing the laboring man. If the families of these men are undernourished, if fitting shelter and clothing cannot be secured because of inadequate wages or high cost of living, our priests should be the first to know it. They should be spokesmen and champions of men who toil.

All our priests have spent many years in the study of philosophical principles, the entire code of morality, and the social sciences. Many of our priests have made graduate studies during several years in the field of social justice, economics, and labor. The daily lives of our priests, in dealing with all groups, make them familiar with the principles governing human relations; they are fearless in proclaiming them.

Men who do not know basic principles can be divided into two classes that cause concern today: First, those who are unreasonably conservative

\* 2423 Auburn Ave., Cincinnati 19, Ohio, Nov. 9, 1945.

and unwilling to make any change in their thinking in non-essential matters, and, therefore, violate justice in their social and economic life; and second, those half-informed or superficial persons who, desiring to be classified as liberals, take their place in the field of pink or red radicalism without realizing the implications.

Priests, who have had a long and careful training, know that every man should live according to the dignity of a human being and that he is entitled by nature, with the sweat of his brow, to the means which enable him to live in this manner. Our priests, rightfully, are in favor of unions—not in the sense that they must tell every man that he cannot exercise his freedom in refraining from joining a union; but they should try to make all men who toil realize the advantage of unionism. The gains that have been made for the laboring man have come through the unions. The rank and file of union men, because they are honest, should take a resolute stand against all dishonest and selfish leadership in their unions.

Social workers, disregarding or utterly indifferent to, or ignorant of the moral code, advise parents who toil that they cannot rear a normal-sized family because of economic reasons. If our economy prevents the rearing of a normal family according to moral standards, then that economy should be modified or rejected, because it is iniquitous and abhorrent to everyone who has cultivated a true moral sense. Whenever birth prevention is encouraged because of economic reasons, priests must condemn that economy.

Parents must realize that children constitute their priceless riches. To have these children instructed under their direction is a serious responsibility; to train these children to be good citizens and faithful in the practice of their religion is the all-important duty of parenthood.



Man is truly the steward of his possessions in the sight of God and has therefore definite responsibilities both of justice and charity toward his fellow man with respect to the use he makes of his property.—*Bishops' Statement on Social Order*, 1940.

## THE EDITORIAL MIND

### *Block Peacetime Conscription*

PEOPLE should beware of becoming stamped into any change in their opposition to the peacetime conscription of youth simply because President Truman has hooked up universal military training with the demand for the unification of the Army, Navy and air forces under one Cabinet control.

The two propositions are in no manner interdependent. Universal military training in peacetime is an undesirable, un-American and unnecessary departure from our democratic traditions, and totally destructive of our avowed desire for peace. It is valuable, in the present confused state of our foreign policy, chiefly as a bargaining factor in power politics.

Placing all our armed forces under one control, with a single authority in the President's Cabinet, is a matter largely of technical military judgment. If experiences in the war have proved the advisability of a unified control, there seems little reason for popular reaction against the proposal.

But the question of peacetime conscription is of vital concern to the

American public. There is hardly a family in the nation that will not be affected fundamentally by its far-reaching demands. It will have its deleterious effect on the moral life of American youth. It will throw out of kilter the educational system of the country. Adjustments in our industrial order and professional life will be necessary by the interruption of a year or more in youth's preparation for his life-work.

And all this change would be made to meet a doubtful need. Without due investigation of the military demands under the new modes of warfare, consequent on the use of the atomic bomb, and with insufficient evidence of any near prospect of war, proponents of the measure are trying to stampede the nation into this radical disruption of American life and democratic tradition.

And they are passing over in discreet silence, as if it were unworthy of consideration, the immense annual expense it would add to our already overwhelming national debt.

After all the public hearings and the mustering of big names and brass hats to speak in its favor, the obvious objections to peacetime conscription have gone unanswered.

But Congress is elected to represent the American people and each Congressman should be told by his constituents that the American people are not convinced of the need, and do not want universal military training in peacetime.—THE EVANGELIST, *Albany, N. Y., Dec. 28, 1945.*

### *Woman's New Role*

**I**N HIS IMPORTANT recent address to a group of women, His Holiness Pope Pius XII, dealing with a program of woman's duties in the social and political life of today, summed up what womanhood's current problem is with these words: "The whole problem regarding woman, both in its entirety and in all its many details, resolves itself into preserving and augmenting that dignity which woman has had from God."

The Holy Father has taken cognizance of the place that woman has gained in the modern world, an entry into public life, as he says, that "came about suddenly as a result of social upheavals." Since woman has entered public life, the Holy Father points out, then she should take advantage of the opportunity for good, but more than that, he warns—she has the obligation to be active, to combat the currents that threaten the home and doctrines that undermine its foundation.

Much, too, can be accomplished,

the Holy Father points out, by women, in the preservation of peace and in opposing war, and in opposing national policies based on constant striving for economic and national empire which leads to war.

The Holy Father's address is a clear-cut program of guidance for women, who, not burdened by the duties of family or home, are engaged in public life or public activities, and even for those with families. His plea is for woman, traditionally idealistic and noble, to use her goodness and her love of the good for the welfare of the family, the nation and the peace of the world, but likewise to preserve and increase the dignity of woman.—CATHOLIC ACTION OF THE SOUTH, *New Orleans, La., Nov. 1, 1945.*

### *Jazz Music—A Symptom*

**W**E would like to believe the Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra conductor who says that there is an increasing interest in classical music. We do not think, however, he means that people in general will turn from jazz to symphonies.

Most musicians deny to jazz the right to be called music. It is only a symptom. People take to jazz because they are jazz minded and live in what is more or less a jazz age. It is not easy to understand jazz, for the simple reason that there is nothing about it to understand. It is

neither purposeful nor expressive, and neither excites nor soothes any understandable emotions.

The mind attuned to jazz does not know where it is going and arrives nowhere. The jazz-minded who make up so much of our age are restless but do not know why. Their feet move in time with the saxophone but their heads remain stationary. They are all for speed. They do not wish to get anything done quickly but just want to be speedy. Thinking is too slow a process for the jazz mind. Leap first and think afterwards, if you are still alive. The speed maniac whose automobile flashes by us is seldom going anywhere in particular. His jazzy brain is not functioning and he makes a perfect jazz stop when he crashes into another automobile. When a jazzy stock market dance starts, everybody joins in and it all ends with a big slump.

To reason with a jazz-minded person is to bore him. To ask him to think is an insult. He is never guided by experience, for that would not be up to date. Jazz excuses everything in pleasure if only "a good time" can be had. Jazzy honesty in business justifies anything that can be got by with. Preachers bring jazz into their pulpits and their sermons are published in the morning papers.

One of the sources of our present day troubles is that we have put jazz into so much of our lives. We have been thinking too much in jazz time,

We hope that the professor is right when he sees a slackening of jazz. We trust that it means the symptom is abating and the disease from which the world suffers is being cured.—THE INDIANA CATHOLIC AND RECORD, Indianapolis, Ind., August 31, 1945.

### Church Population Figures

ACCORDING to figures revealed last week in the new edition of the *Yearbook of American Churches* Catholics form by far the largest religious body in the United States. One out of every three church-goers is a Catholic.

Total church membership in this country for 1943 and 1944 was estimated at 72,492,669 persons. This equals 52.5 per cent of the national population. Despite larger church membership reported, the fact remains that almost half of the American population is not affiliated with any religious organization.

The yearbook lists 256 different religious bodies. Thirteen of these report more than a million members.

The report lists 23,419,701 Catholics (a figure that is 500,000 below that of the *Official Catholic Directory* for 1945).

The 23 different Baptist groups are credited with 14,208,193 members. Twenty Methodist groups list 9,942,842 and 20 Lutheran denominations have a total of 5,129,147.

All "Protestant" bodies have a total membership of 41,943,104 and those of Jewish groups have 4,641,184.

Although Catholics may take heart at their impressive number, the report nevertheless calls for considerable serious reflection. In the first place it should be remembered that America in its origin counted an overwhelming proportion of church-goers. Today the "organized" believers hardly hold their own, despite constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion and despite the lip service paid to God in public life.

On the Catholic side, also, the apparently bright picture is overshadowed by anxious questions. The numbers themselves are impressive only in relation to the even poorer showing of the other denominations. It has been argued in Catholic periodicals that the Catholic total of

some 23 million might well reach 30 million with more exact methods of tabulation. But even if this is true, the 30 million would still fall far short of what might have been foreseen a few decades ago. The predominantly urban character of American Catholicism, the inroads of birth control, and the plague of mixed marriages are obviously taking their annual toll.

The implications of the situation are obvious: In a world drifting towards religious dissolution, it is up to the Catholic people, collectively and individually, to work and pray with all the strength they can muster, that they might grow in faith and knowledge and virtue and strength to resist the tide and, even more, to show forth the light of Christian faith to a world hungry for truth and peace.—THE WANDERER, *Saint Paul, Minn.*, October 18, 1945.



### *Russian Freedom*

In effect the Russians have but one newspaper, under different names. The opinions and information offered them must satisfy the "people," and the "people," in Russia, are a small group of party members and officials. Any other opinions or information are, as the *Pravda* writer, David Zaslavsky, says, "exterior" and condemned. We can begin to believe in Russian freedom when *Pravda* or any other Russian newspaper can speak as candidly about the heads of Government as we do about the President and Congress.—*The New York Times*, September 26, 1945.

# America and the United Nations

THE REV. HARRY C. KOENIG

*An address delivered before the Charles Carroll Forum of Chicago, November 11, 1945.*

**A** NARCHY is defined by the dictionary as the absence of government. Where there is no government, there disorder and lawlessness run riot. Men who profess this doctrine and who promote such a state of affairs are called anarchists. They are truly to be feared by all law-abiding citizens. Consequently Americans and Catholics have no use for anarchists.

In Chicago there is a local government, at Springfield there is a State government, at Washington there is a national government, but in the world at large there is no government, there is nothing else than anarchy. One who does not believe in international government is called an isolationist; and an isolationist, whether he intends it or not, is an international anarchist—not an anarchist in local affairs, not an anarchist in national affairs, but an anarchist in international affairs.

When there is a local dispute in Chicago, it is settled by the municipal courts. When there is a dispute between two cities in Illinois, it is settled by the State courts. When there is a dispute between States, it is settled by the Federal courts. But when there is a dispute between nations, it is settled by battleships

and bombers because there never has been any universally recognized international court.

If there were no disputes between nations, if each nation were a hermetically sealed unit, then perhaps no international government would be necessary. But if we Americans expect to sail ships to Brazil for coffee, to Malaya for tin, to the East Indies for rubber; if we plan to fly planes to England and to France; if we hope to sell radios and automobiles to Italy and Spain; then is it not reasonable to establish some kind of international government to settle those disputes which will arise at times between the United States and these other nations?

In the not too distant past when two gentlemen had a quarrel, they challenged each other to a duel. They tried to settle the issue by swords or pistols. The justice of the dispute had nothing to do with the result. Usually it ended with the death of one of the participants. It was a very foolish way to settle a dispute; and the Catholic Church repeatedly condemned duels.

During the past forty years disputes between nations have been settled by duels on an international scale. Instead of the two duelists



with their seconds, we have witnessed two large armies with their nations behind them. The armies used superfortresses, rockets and tanks to decide the issue. The justice of the question had no direct effect on the result. The nation with the most powerful army and the latest equipment won the engagement whether justice was on its side or not. International war has been a very foolish way to settle international quarrels; and the Catholic Church has repeatedly condemned war as a method of settling disagreements between nations.

#### THE CHARTER

No longer do individuals challenge one another to duels. They now resolve their differences according to due process of law. Is it not high time that nations cease challenging one another to international duels and endeavor to arbitrate their disputes by submitting them to international tribunals? Because the vast majority of Americans have reached this sensible conclusion, they support the United Nations Charter. They realize that this Charter establishes legal machinery for settling disagreements between nations.

In discussing the United Nations Charter we would be guilty of grave error if we were to suppose that it could be subjected to the same sort of theoretical debate that was found effective with the Dumbarton Oaks

Proposals just a year ago. At Dumbarton Oaks statesmen from the Big Four blueprinted a tentative outline for an international organization. They explicitly asked their constituents for suggestions and amendments. But the United Nations Charter is no tentative proposal. It is the actual constitution of a world institution which really exists now that the Charter has been ratified by twenty-nine signatory states including the five permanent members. And what is of first importance to us Americans is the fact that the United States Senate—hitherto the stubborn adversary of all international organization—has approved the Charter by an almost unanimous vote.

Of course this does not mean that we have forfeited our constitutional right to criticize the defects of the Charter. Public and constructive criticism of legislation is always a sign of a healthy democracy. But if we were to confine our efforts to a mere enumeration of the Charter's flaws, our contribution to world peace would indeed be small. The Charter has defects, altogether too many of them. In no way should they be minimized and every effort should be made to eliminate them as soon as possible. But let us never forget that the Charter was hammered out in the heat of debate by the compromises of fifty nations. It is entirely pleasing to no one nation. Consequently we should not be sur-

prised that it does not satisfy all our hopes. Furthermore, its shortcomings, such as the veto power, the lack of compulsory jurisdiction, the failure to recognize the moral law and to provide for disarmament, have already been widely publicized. What we as Catholics and as Americans need to know is how far the Charter fulfils the Christian principles for a just and lasting peace.

The twentieth century has been direly menaced by the continuing threat of international war. Throughout these years the Popes guiding the Church have seriously studied this acute problem because they understand that war is a malignant cancer which slowly eats away religion and morality. From Leo XIII to Pius XII they have consistently taught that an international organization is one of the prime requisites for world peace. Leo XIII enthusiastically supported The Hague Conferences, from which eventuated the International Court of Arbitration. In his famous Peace Proposals of 1917 Benedict XV suggested an international institution for compulsory arbitration. To the world's regret and ultimate sorrow these proposals were rejected by the belligerents. After the Armistice Benedict XV supported the idea of the League of Nations and the same policy was pursued by his successor, Pius XI. Here it is interesting to note that either American Catholics remained blissfully ignorant of Papal

policy or else they refused to follow Vatican leadership. Certainly there was no articulate American Catholic leadership supporting the League of Nations or promoting the idea of international organization.

Since his elevation more than six years ago Pius XII has spent the better part of his time explaining the Christian principles underlying international peace. In the third point of his celebrated 1939 Christmas Message the Holy Father said:

Human frailty renders it difficult, not to say impossible, to foresee every contingency and guard against every danger at the moment in which treaties are signed; passion and bitter feeling are apt to be still rife. Hence, in order that a peace may be honorably accepted and in order to avoid arbitrary breaches and unilateral interpretations of treaties, it is of the first importance to erect some juridical institution which shall guarantee the loyal and faithful fulfilment of the conditions agreed upon, and which shall, in case of recognized need, revise and correct them.

It is necessary to cite these explicit words of Pius XII because a considerable number of Catholics hesitate to support the United Nations Charter, maintaining that they are scandalized by the grave injustices perpetrated against Poland, against the Baltic and the Balkan States by the Potsdam and the Yalta Agreements. No one has condemned these injustices more frequently and more boldly than Pius XII who foresaw them as a consequence of vicious

propaganda and of the bitter hatreds engendered by the war. But instead of being arguments against an international institution these very injustices constitute in the Pope's opinion the fundamental reason why we should champion an international organization. Without an international organization these injustices never will be rectified except through another and more disastrous conflict. That briefly is the grand dilemma now facing us—future international disagreements will be settled either by an international institution or by international war. If you persist in refusing to recognize the necessity of international organization, you must begin to prepare for the inevitable third world war.

#### UNITY AND BROTHERHOOD

Papal pleas for international organization do not stem from the personal whims of recent Popes. They are solidly grounded upon two doctrines basic to our faith—viz., the unity of the human race and the brotherhood of man. The Church teaches that all men are descended from common parents—Adam and Eve. For this reason there is no distinction of race or color or nationality in our Church. It is truly catholic or universal. Accordingly, it is only natural that such a church, being itself international in the very best sense, should promote the establishment of an international institution to settle disputes,

What is more dear to the Christian soul than the dogma of the brotherhood of man? But so often has it been repeated by popular demagogues and after-dinner orators that it has been emptied of much of its meaning. What it actually means is that all men are brothers of Jesus Christ and consequently brothers of one another. If you regard all men as your brothers, then logically you will favor an international organization which will arbitrate disputes between nations and thus keep all men united in brotherhood.

Suppose that we concede that the Popes and Catholic doctrine recommend the establishment of international institutions, does it still follow that Pius XII and Catholic teaching favor the United Nations and their Charter? Today this is the all-important question before us. Examining the record, as Al Smith used to say, we find that Pius XII has not endorsed the Charter in any public statement. This may be something of a surprise and something of a disappointment, too, until we remember that the Charter is a political document and that the Popes expressly refrain from approving political documents. It is their duty to enunciate moral and social principles to guide the Faithful. The Faithful in turn are obliged to apply these principles to political situations as they arise in different lands.

Today the United Nations is the

only viable international organization in existence. There are others on paper and still others in the brilliant minds of political theorists but hope for their actuation is indeed slight. Instead of pursuing the phantom of absolute perfection, let us take the present Charter, despite its many defects, support it courageously and strive earnestly to better it. The Charter provides for its own amendment and in the course of years it can be considerably improved. For the present it will provide a real foundation which can be continually reinforced and upon which the edifice of peace can be slowly erected.

The Charter has many features which Catholics can heartily approve. First, there is the Economic and Social Council, a subsidiary of the General Assembly yet one of the most important agencies in the Charter. Its purpose is twofold: first, to study and to issue reports on economic, social and cultural problems; secondly, to promote respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all peoples without distinction of race, language or religion. This Council will answer a real need because most modern international quarrels have their origins in economic and social injustices and hitherto there has been no adequate machinery for adjusting these inequalities. All to its credit, too, is the fact that it is not hamstrung with any permanent members or veto re-

strictions. With these considerations in mind can we not truly say that the Economic and Social Council fulfils the advice of Pius XI who wrote in his immortal Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*:

Since the various nations largely depend on one another in economic matters and need one another's help, they should strive with a united purpose and effort to promote, by wisely conceived pacts and institutions, a prosperous and happy international cooperation in economic life.

Another feature of the Charter that will find immediate favor with Americans is the International Court of Justice. Throughout the years American courts have earned our profound respect; and they have served us faithfully by interpreting the law and by rendering judgments in controversies. In a larger sphere the same fields will be open to the International Court of Justice. International law will frequently need interpretation and clarification. And of international disputes that will clamor for a court's decision there will be no end as long as nations are guided by weak and sinful men.

This International Court of Justice has been established as an integral part of the United Nations.

In this respect the Charter is a decided improvement over the League of Nations, which always remained completely separated from the World Court. But even though the International Court is a constituent organ of the United Nations, still it lacks

the vital element of compulsory jurisdiction. In other words, if two nations find themselves at loggerheads over some issue, they may choose to submit their case to the Court; but they cannot be forced to accept either the jurisdiction of the court or its decision. Compulsory jurisdiction for the International Court has been proposed by the Popes and by the American Bishops; but it was rejected at San Francisco mainly by the efforts of the United States and Russia. Before arousing our ire against Russia, let us wisely throw all our energies into converting Americans to this Christian idea of submitting international quarrels to the Court of Justice. If the United States were to follow the unselfish example of twenty-eight other nations which have already promised to submit to compulsory jurisdiction, then we could honestly point the finger of shame at Russia. In the meanwhile it would be well to recall that the Russians are not as fortunate as we who have the Popes and the American Bishops to guide us.

We Americans believe in the human dignity and sacred liberty of the individual citizen, in the necessity of justice for peaceful living, in equal rights for large and small nations. So dear are these principles to our hearts that we have fought wars to preserve them. They have been vigorously and fearlessly proclaimed by Pius XII in his peace messages; but,

curiously enough, they were conspicuously absent from the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals. Justice, which is the very foundation of peace, was not even mentioned at Dumbarton Oaks. These deficiencies were called to the attention of the American delegates at San Francisco by the different consultants who represented forty-two of our national organizations. Our delegates immediately recognized the necessity of these principles and succeeded in incorporating them into the Charter.

Altogether seven hundred amendments to the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals were suggested at San Francisco by delegates from fifty participating nations. More than four hundred of these amendments were actually written into the Charter. These facts should encourage us for the future. No one dares to deny that the Charter is still a very imperfect document. Public opinion must be aroused against its defects. If Christians in different countries insist upon moral principles, then many of these deficiencies can be easily corrected once that the United Nations begins to function.

#### THE ATOMIC BOMB

Today no discussion of the Charter would be complete without consideration of the atomic bomb. During recent weeks so much has been written about this new weapon that it is not easy to ascertain the real

truth. From the welter of scientific testimony general agreement appears to be possible on at least three points: viz., 1) the atomic bomb will be an American secret for only a limited time; 2) its destructive powers will be greatly increased; 3) no defense has been, or apparently can be, devised against it.

If these assertions be true, then the atomic bomb offers us the very simple alternative of international co-operation or annihilation. Either we will support a genuine international organization like the United Nations that will control the production of atomic bombs while at the same time it settles international controversies by peaceful means; or else each nation will frantically engage in a mad and expensive race to produce bigger atomic bombs and longer range rockets so that every time an international crisis arises, Christian civilization will totter on the brink of utter destruction.

No longer can you shrug your shoulders and say that international affairs are not your concern. The first atomic bomb of the next war may well land in the United States. You and your family and your home may be instantly pulverized into fine dust. It is a ghastly prospect. Faced with this future, many are inclined to become pessimists. They lament the

progress of science, they weep over the wickedness of the world, they fear other nations, they have no confidence in world organization.

Pius XII fortunately is not one of their number. He is thoroughly Christian, fired with the virtue of hope. Sometime ago he said: "The call of the moment is not lamentation but action; not lamentation over what has been but reconstruction of what is to arise and must arise for the good of society." What must arise for the good of society is a functioning United Nations. It will arise if Americans give it their enthusiastic support.

Let us take our cue from the Pope and be realists, not pessimists. There are difficulties to overcome; there are troubles ahead. In entering the United Nations we are trying something new. Some mistakes will occur. The interests of other nations will conflict at times with ours. Working with Russia will not be the least of our worries. But if the world becomes convinced that we will co-operate with good will, that we will spend our tireless energies in promoting peace, then better days are in store for humanity. Today the world looks to us for the same leadership in peace that we gave in war. What sincere Catholic and loyal American can refuse this challenge?

# *The Philosophy of Destruction*

ANDREW FORBES

*Reprinted from The CATHOLIC TIMES\**

**E**VENTS moved quickly after Hiroshima was wiped out by the first Atomic Bomb—so quickly that many people were able to forget the immediate moral and physical revulsion at the news. The justification of the weapon seemed to come with its success. The war was ending. The prisoners would be freed and innumerable Allied lives would be saved. The point was elaborated that by the mercy of God we beat the Germans in the race of research (though nobody argues that the Japanese were in the running) and President Truman reminded us of all the Japanese inhumanities.

Mr. Churchill, in one of his speeches last year, was on firmer ground when he argued that we do not act as our enemies act, but as we are constrained by our own nature, to vindicate a justice and a mercy which the enemy has violated. The second atomic bomb, on Nagasaki, already brought evidence of our own demoralisation. Its action was written up far more in the vein of a "wizard prang" made familiar in the European War. General Spaatz was able to declare that the results observed were "excellent."

By a terrible coincidence the same week saw the publication of the code for the punishment of war criminals for violations of the laws or customs of war, among them the murder or extermination of any civilian population. Undoubtedly, if the Germans had been the first to use the new explosive (for that is what it is, not a substitute for oil or coal in a future Utopia) we would have indicted them, if possible, under this very clause.

Now the Allies are at far removed from the earlier declarations of Vice-President Wallace that we are entering the Century of the Common Man, whom we would liberate from the tyranny of false philosophies. We cannot justify the extermination of perhaps half a million of the Common Man in two cataclysms except on the Nazi principle that they are sub-men. Or, if the argument is used that one cannot draw the line between "area bombing" or the ten-ton bomb and this latest device, the answer is that the use of the atomic bomb shows how far wrong we had already gone in the employment of indiscriminate weapons.

The line can be drawn at the point

\* Glasgow, Scotland, Aug. 17, 1945.



where it is still possible to aim at a specified military target without deliberately exterminating large masses of the civilian population. If a whole industrial town can be regarded as war potential, it is still possible to warn the inhabitants specifically of their danger. One can imagine four or five ways in which the nature of the atomic bomb could have been illustrated to the Japanese General Staff—by dropping it first in a barren area or off shore—without the element of moral degradation brought upon the Allies and upon the human race by the sudden destruction of Hiroshima.

In one form or another, the defensive argument is always that the end justifies the means. A principle falsely alleged against the Jesuits is now demonstrated as the mainspring of military and political action. We have quickly forgotten an historical precedent, often quoted when we were suffering under Germany's V-weapons, that a secret weapon proposed by Admiral Cochran was turned down by the Cabinet in an earlier war on the ground that it was infallible and inhuman. For the mark of the atomic bomb is that it universally shocked consciences—even of men and women who seemed to gain by its use—and what is more, it shocked the consciences of scientists engaged upon the research.

Sir James Chadwick was reported in the *News Chronicle* of August 10

as having said in Washington: "I do not know how it was in this country, but many of my own people were unwilling to join (in research on the bomb). Many at one time or another hoped it would not work—that something would be found to establish definitely that it could not work. I often hoped myself that it would not work." This is the show-down of the current cant that the scientist is the pure research worker, the empiricist, who need not take moral considerations into account. Unhappily these scientists behaved with singular frivolity, for they did not know what might happen when they caused the first explosion, and they still do not know the full effect of the forces they have unleashed.

However, the thing has been done. We have to face the consequences. We can agree that the Western Allies showed greater responsibility than the Germans would ever have shown if the weapon had been in their hands. We can agree that the Press, after a few days, gave space to the flood of protests, unlike the Press of totalitarian countries.

#### RULE OF FEAR

But the outstanding fact is that the rule of men has now passed into the hands of the small groups who possess the new power, of which the ultimate sanction is fear. This is not the sanction of rule by consent. We do not gather grapes from thorns or



figs from thistles. It may be better that the Anglo-Saxons should possess this domination because among them is still retained the waning tradition of the West; but there is an equal danger of some future conflict between two rival Power Groups for the control of mankind. Nor is there any guarantee that the minority who wield such force have the moral principles by which to ensure the well-being of the human race. No recent International Conference has provided that assurance.

As long ago as 1914 a novel by H. G. Wells very accurately foretold the release of atomic energy; and we may well ponder the social philosophy outlined by him. For what he saw was a conflict between an old order and a new, a conflict resolved by a conference of "responsible and understanding people" under the shock of the atomic bomb.

"On the one hand was the ancient

life of the family and the small community and the petty industry, on the other was a new life on a larger scale with remoter horizons and a strange sense of purpose. Already it was growing clear that men must live on one side or the other. . . ."

Indeed we do not know what ideology will be the orthodoxy of the future, but we do know that the controlling groups will have the means to enforce their will. And there one is irresistibly reminded of Benson's *Lord of the World*, for bewildered mankind is now facing not so much a vista of long peace as a chaos of unimaginable horrors, and is in a state to succumb to any secular messiah. After the bombs dropped in the Far East can we look for the restoration of "the ancient life of the family and the small community and the petty industry?" Or will the philosophy of the nihilists be carried to its conclusion?



### *Buying Workers*

A ten-figure bank balance gives no man or group of men the right or the justification to use or "buy" workers as physical producers at whatever price that individual or group decides, nor does money give any individual or group of men the power or the right to negate justice towards fellow men. Justice is based on God-given principles, not on dollar signs and bank balances. The late Pope Pius XI condemned the view that labor is a commodity to be bought at the cheapest price.—  
CATHOLIC ACTION OF THE SOUTH, September 27, 1945.

# The Charter and Its Consequences

RICHARD PATTEE

*Reprinted from COLUMBIA\**

THE San Francisco Charter, ratified by the U. S. Senate on July 28, very obviously was far from what most of those who attended the Conference hoped it would be. It falls far short of satisfying most of the requirements that internationally-minded citizens everywhere must feel are the necessities for a decent and workable world order. The total impression of the two months at San Francisco is that there was far too much emphasis on force, strength and power and much too little on justice, humanity and pacific relations. There was far too much attention paid to security as such against justice and one would scarcely exaggerate to say, that the document that came out of the Conference reflects the insistence on security above all things and that justice as such—as a principle and as a standard of international conduct—went pretty much by the board.

If we measure the achievements at San Francisco, as indicated in the Charter, by the norms laid down by the Holy Father in his numerous allocutions, we will be disappointed to discover how many of these fundamental ideas are either neglected altogether or else are given a minimum

of consideration in the text. The ideal of a new society of nations, created among the strong and the weak alike with similar responsibilities and similar duties in proportion to their potentialities, was cast overboard.

The general line adopted by the Soviet Union from the beginning of the conference became increasingly the theme song of the gathering—that power and strength justify the exercise of authority and that we should approach the problem of the peace realistically: that is, leave the actual enforcement of the peace and the determination of when that enforcement must take place in the hands of the nations able to deal with these situations—in other words, the Great Powers. Thus it was that, in spite of the fairly elaborate camouflage, the San Francisco Charter was in reality and will continue to be a perpetuation of the grand alliance of the United Nations who won the present war, with two definite categories among these victorious states: the strong, who will have full responsibility, and the second raters, including the so-called small states, who will be privileged to collaborate and to make their opinions heard in

\* New Haven 7, Conn., October, 1945.

the General Assembly but with a minimum of influence on decisions and much less on action.

Now we should bear in mind one thing and that is, that it is not necessarily bad, unmitigatedly bad, that there should exist a strong alliance of the five dominant nations in the world. The threat to peace is not going to come from Luxembourg, Liberia or Honduras. It is not going to be jeopardized by the aggressive tendencies of Saudi Arabia. The only potential aggression of which we need have any fear will proceed from one or more of the great nations of the world. If effective steps are not taken to bind them together in a firm and lasting understanding, with the full sharing of their collective responsibilities, then there is little practical use for an international league of nations and still less for the elaborate machinery that was set up at San Francisco.

During the course of that conference, Commander Stassen, a member of the United States delegation, stated quite frankly that if a major power—one of the Big Five—embarked on a policy of aggression, there was no international organization that could stop it. This meant in plain language that unless there is real and substantial agreement among the Big Five, we can have little hope for peace regardless of what the rest of the nations may say, think or do. In the League of Na-

tions at Geneva, in which the responsibility of the larger powers is much less fixed than in the present constitution, it was perfectly clear that once a large state undertook to carry out a policy opposed to the letter or spirit of the Covenant, there was nothing the League could do except to protest. The case of Japanese aggression in Manchuria and of Italian aggression against Ethiopia are cases in point.

#### HONESTY OF PURPOSE

One of the commonest errors some years ago in dealing with the League of Nations was to speak and write of it as though it were an abstraction, above and beyond the nations that made it up. No league of states exists independently of the component elements. The League of Nations was as weak or as strong as the nations that sent delegates to Geneva wanted to make it. When Japan and Italy, two powerful members, took the opposite course and flaunted the purposes of the international organization itself, the failure that was inevitably chalked up was not against the League but against the attitude of mind of some of its members—of most of its members, to be honest—who did not subscribe *really* to the ideas behind that organization. A first-rate international league can hardly be a brilliant success when none of the member states approaches it honestly and with the full intention

of carrying through all its principles.

An institution of this kind, set up with a thousand mental reservations, is foredoomed to failure. The failure of the Geneva league was the intransigence of France, the aggressiveness of Japan, the unwillingness to obey of Italy, the timidity of Great Britain and the isolationism of the United States. On the shoulders of these victorious powers, each in pursuit of a kind of foreign policy that made the work of the League impossible, should be placed the real responsibility for the dismal lack of success that haunted that organization, conceived in high hopes and supported so disastrously by its own creators.

This means, in a few words, that we ought not to let ourselves be carried away with the feeling that everything is lost because the Great Powers have been given extraordinary powers in the new league. Of course they have; and it is probably better at this time and in these circumstances that they should be accorded this authority. It means, to be sure, that we have elevated the idea of "security" to the position of the purpose of the whole thing and have relegated "justice" to an inferior level. The statesmen at San Francisco thought first and foremost in terms of security. They were vowed before everything else to place obstacles in the way of a repetition of war. They wanted to guarantee

a reasonably long peace and were willing to violate the precepts of democracy and even of justice to do it. Hence, we have a Security Council in which five nations of the world have practically all the authority and a General Assembly in which the rest of the world can lift its voice, pose questions and function in the atmosphere of an international debating society.

One of the basic reasons for this state of affairs is that San Francisco did not reveal the least willingness on the part of the statesmen to relinquish any substantial part of that precious thing known as the "national sovereignty." We ought to be perfectly honest with ourselves and recognize that we shall never have a democratic international organization, a league that really functions and in which the interests of all are proportionately represented, until we scrap many of the time-honored and conventional notions about sovereignty. Even the disastrous war through which we have just gone has not been enough for us to arrive at the conviction that it is high time that we come down off the lofty plane of theoretically absolute sovereignty and give up some portion of that heritage in the name of peace and international solidarity.

No more sorry spectacle was to be seen at San Francisco than the constant harping on national interests, on the national position and on the

national policy. Much as one would like to defend the rights of the small countries and brilliantly as they were defended by such stalwarts as Dr. Evatt, of Australia, it would be difficult to find any case in which one of the small nations evinced any willingness to give up some of its sovereignty and sacrifice at least something of the devotion to this fetish in behalf of world peace. The answer is, of course, that the small nations could hardly be expected to do what the large powers were quite unwilling to undertake. And this is entirely accurate. The Great Powers were as obdurate and tenacious in their concept of national rights as though no war had ever taken place.

In spite of the terrific lessons of this struggle and the evidence that has been placed before the world of the incredible evil of nationalism, which is merely another way of saying undue regard for national sovereignty, the San Francisco conclave was not a meeting ground of minds chastised by the conflict or humbled by the stark realities through which we have just passed. The squabbles, the rancor, the resentments, the petty ambitions and aspirations, the tugging, pulling and jockeying, which have distinguished world politics for these many decades, were all present at San Francisco.

It would be an interesting point to contrast the new charter now approved by our government with

the Covenant of the League of Nations. Christopher Dawson, the distinguished English Catholic writer, has called attention to the fact that, in moral terms, the Covenant was considerably more acceptable than the new instrument. Even at that the San Francisco Charter is a vast improvement over the original proposal of Dumbarton Oaks, which served as the rough draft for the work at San Francisco. The almost total absence in Dumbarton Oaks of any allusion, even backhandedly, to moral questions, human rights or the principles that ought to govern society, was little short of shocking. The extremely lame excuse was given that since the Charter would have to represent the interests and aims of people so diverse as the Moslems, European Christians and Soviet Russians, it was impossible to incorporate any solid declaration of moral principles in the document. In the San Francisco revision, there is considerably more attention paid to this aspect and in that sense it is a very great improvement.

#### DOMINATION BORN AT DUMBARTON OAKS

Dumbarton Oaks, as originally drafted, provided the framework for the complete domination of the Big Five. No amount of reading into it of other ideas can avoid that fundamental conclusion. At San Francisco, the decisions of the larger powers, as reached at Dumbarton Oaks, were

challenged by the smaller states, all of whom brought to San Francisco copious suggestions for amendment and revision. They succeeded only in part. In the actual structure of the new league, there is not much relaxation of this formula. There is, however, provision for more opportunity for discussion on the part of the smaller states and the articles on amendments and the like hold out the hope that experience will make improvement feasible as time goes on.

If we were to list the failures of the San Francisco Charter, the number of drawbacks or actual defects appears long indeed. There is no recognition anywhere of the primacy of the moral law. There is no expression whatever that the states of the world, just as the individuals, are subject to the same moral law and that unless this subordination is assured, we can scarcely look for lasting peace. There is no definite limitation on national sovereignty and no step toward the creation of a world community of nations. Mentally speaking, San Francisco belongs to the same period as the Versailles Conference and, if we were to press the analogy still further, to the same period as the Congress of Berlin. Equilibrium, national interests, spheres and the like all turned up at San Francisco and had their day. There was no tendency to do the novel or the audacious thing; that is, throw overboard the whole idea of

international relations as they have developed since the last century and proceed on a totally different basis. The war has not led us this far.

In all probability the United States would be the last nation to subscribe to any international formula that went very far from the old traditional bases. And the astonishing thing is that on the old basis we have had nothing but the constant degeneration of international relations and their frequent breakdown in the form of war. Yet we are quite unwilling to try anything else or even accept the possibility that another rule of procedure might be productive of better results. We might reflect on the fact that no sooner had the Charter come up in the Senate than the hoary and ancient argument was raised whether this meant that American boys would have to be sent overseas without the specific consent of the Senate. The mentality of 1945 was not too different from that of 1919. The difference seemed to be that those who prevailed then were outnumbered this time or perhaps are merely biding their time to attack the new international institution on other grounds and at a later date.

Another failure relates to the adequate codification of International Law and the endowment of the new International Tribunal with police power to put its decisions into practice. No compulsory jurisdiction is included either and the most that is

achieved is the setting up of the tribunal itself. The list of the items on which the five Great Powers may exercise an absolute veto leaves the impression that there is relatively little margin or leeway.

#### JUSTICE AND HUMAN RIGHTS

Since the document has been adopted and will be the constitution under which we shall all be called upon to live internationally for some little time at least, perhaps it would be more profitable to emphasize the more positive attainments of the San Francisco Charter. As evidence of the improvement over Dumbarton Oaks we discover that the new Charter is much more idealistic in its expression and at least includes mention of justice as a term even though it does not breathe into that term the full concept of morality under which any institution must function. In Dumbarton Oaks there was no reference to justice at all, either as a principle or as a purpose. We find the term justice used in the preamble in the phrase "to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties, etc." Under the Purposes, reference is made to the "principles of justice and international law." A still further mention of justice is made in the sentence that reads: "All members . . . shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and

security and justice shall not be endangered."

Closely related to this question of the inclusion of justice is that of human rights. In Dumbarton Oaks, the most passing reference was made to human rights and this in the most perfunctory fashion. It was clear at San Francisco from the start that there would be much insistence on expressly including mention of the salient human rights that ought to be defended. Their absence, as the Bishops of the United States very clearly indicated in their letter of April 15th, would be inconceivable. The war has been fought in fundamental terms for the defense of human rights. To institute an international organization pledged to the maintenance of peace without mention of the human rights that must be safeguarded, appeared the most evident contradiction to many of those at the Conference. The present Charter does fairly well on this score. In the Preamble the phrase reads: "To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person." "Human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, language, religion, or sex" appears among the Purposes of the United Nations organization. Among the functions of the General Assembly are "initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of . . . assisting in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all."



Similar statements are to be found in connection with the purposes and tasks of the Social and Economic Council.

Dumbarton Oaks was largely silent on the problem of International Law. This was remedied at San Francisco, to include steps for the progressive development of international law and its codification. Dumbarton Oaks was not particularly specific on the formation of the new International Tribunal of Justice and precisely what its relations were to be with the general organization. At San Francisco full attention was paid to the setting up of the Court and it was specifically provided that this instrument should form an integral part of the new league of nations—in contrast with the state of affairs under The Hague Tribunal.

Provision is not made as was indicated for compulsory jurisdiction, but there is a tendency to make the decisions of the Court binding on members. The major hope is that in the course of natural evolution, the Court will enlarge and solidify its position much as did the Supreme Court of the United States which, under the Constitution of the nation when first adopted, apparently had none of the functions or powers which have later become a part of its tradition. Proposals were made at San Francisco to give the Court compulsory jurisdiction but they were defeated. Members, however, may sign an agreement accepting in advance the jurisdiction of

the Court in legal questions, and the Tribunal may render advisory opinions at the request of the Security Council, of the General Assembly or of other bodies of the league.

Perhaps the most adequate way to summarize in this brief space the salient characteristics of this new international organization is to pay attention to the most important features that distinguish it, to the exclusion of the enormous number of details that would clutter up a presentation as restricted as this. We may cite as the most significant provisions the following:

- I. The Social and Economic Council.
- II. The Security Council and its powers.
- III. The Trusteeship provision.
- IV. Regional organizations and their recognition.
- V. The process of amendment and change.

Under these five headings we can at least catch a glimpse of the mechanism and general character of the United Nations organization.

#### CAUSES OF WAR RECOGNIZED

The Economic and Social Council was raised to the level of a "principal organ" of the United Nations in contrast with the arrangement envisaged originally at Dumbarton Oaks. The very fact that there is to exist an Economic and Social Council of extraordinary importance and with



wide powers is a step forward of incalculable significance. If for no other reason than this, it would be legitimate to assert that San Francisco was a vast advance over anything done before. It does not mean merely that the organization will be empowered to make economic and social studies, deal with questions of standards of living, employment, public health and the like. The meaning of the decision is that for the first time full recognition has been given to the fact that international disturbances do not derive exclusively from political causes. The old Geneva League was perhaps too completely political in its outlook. Although it did have its humanitarian agencies and dealt with a number of problems that were not strictly political, it never possessed an agency as formalized as this one, whose entire purpose is to examine this particular aspect of international relations. It is fortunate that we are getting away from the idea that political friction and turmoil cause wars and recognize that misery, poverty, unbalanced economies, bad health and underprivileged peoples anywhere in the world are the breeding ground for wars and the threat of wars.

The essence of the whole United Nations organization is the Security Council. It was around its purposes and powers that most of the debate at San Francisco centered. It was with regard to its authority that the small nations fought so valiantly to reduce

its power. Foreign Minister Evatt, of Australia, waged a major campaign to curtail the power of the Security Council; not to exercise the veto in matters involving one of the Great Powers themselves (for that was recognized as legitimate) but to restrict the use of the veto on questions that involved other states. The original Soviet proposal had been absolute in its purpose: to forbid not only the action by any other than the Security Council, but to make impossible even the discussion of the problem itself by the General Assembly. The Russians were obdurate in insisting that there was no basic distinction between discussion, investigation and consideration of a problem and that all of these functions should pertain to the Security Council. This extreme demand was whittled down and brought about one of the few major concessions made by the Soviet delegation.

The Big Five did express themselves in the sense that the veto would not be used to prevent any dispute from being brought before the Security Council or discussed by it. Nevertheless, with all of the benevolence in the world, we cannot but conclude that the Security Council retains legally and officially the enormous weight of power and that it is the absolutely essential agency of the new league. In the strictest interpretation of the text of the Charter, it is clear that the Security Council can do practically anything and can prevent practically

anything with which it disagrees from being done.

The General Assembly does retain the right to hold discussions and make recommendations "within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided in the present Charter." This phraseology is indeed all-embracing. Although its authority does not extend beyond recommendation, and in no case can it intervene with the Security Council in the settlement of a dispute, it must always be borne in mind that the General Assembly, as the meeting place of all the nations in the league, provides for a formidable platform for the airing of ideas and even of grievances. This should not be underestimated since even Geneva, with all its handicaps, provided a place where the voice of even the most insignificant state could be raised and heard. The force of public opinion, the strength of public reaction is always incalculable and imponderable. Perhaps the new General Assembly will provide in its way the means whereby the sentiments and feelings of all the nations may be expressed to the world in a form that does not exist today.

Dumbarton Oaks said nothing about the problem of the territories either under mandate at the present time or which might be taken from the enemy as a result of the present war. It will be remembered that the old League of Nations exercised a

mandate over certain areas of the world through the immediate agency of some particular country. These mandates still exist and in addition there are islands and lands, such as the Japanese territories and the former Italian colonies, which will have to be dealt with in some form.

#### THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL

The Trusteeship Council is designated as one of the principal organs of the new league. There are three possibilities as regards territories that might come under this Council. The first are the mandates inherited from the League, the second are enemy territories, and the third those territories which any state might voluntarily place under international trusteeship. Reference is made to the welfare of non-selfgoverning peoples, and the need for providing for the most expeditious means for their progress and advancement. This provision does not attack the vast colonial problem as such. At San Francisco there was no disposition on the part of any of the major colonial powers to make the slightest concession in this field. The French, for example, through the public statements of Georges Bidault, Minister of Foreign Affairs, made it clear that not one inch of French territory would be given up to any international trusteeship system. Great Britain revealed no enthusiastic willingness to cede parts of her Empire. The United States would

probably not be willing to allow Puerto Rico, Guam or the Virgin Islands to come under such control.

In other words, the problem of some 750,000,000 people now living as colonials was not touched at all. The actual jurisdiction of the United Nations organization will scarcely reach beyond the Pacific Islands and perhaps some of the former mandates. A distinction is made between strategic and non-strategic territories. The former are placed under the Security Council and the latter under the General Assembly. Their use of the power of the Trusteeship Council will depend on their own judgment. The United States was especially concerned with the future of the Japanese islands. They may come under full American sovereignty; they may be under trusteeship with the United States exercising the authority under international control. If declared strategic areas, their administration might fall under the United States with the Security Council as a supervisory authority. We must remember that in the Security Council, the United States, as one of the Big Five, has a veto just as does each of the other major powers.

The Soviet Union and China urged that a statement be included that all people now without self-government have the opportunity to look forward to ultimate independence. Great Britain, France and the United States opposed this suggestion. It was pro-

foundly unfortunate that our country quibbled as to terms, for it made us look as though we were lined up with the traditional British and French imperialism. The compromise was one of those weasel worded statements that hedged and hemmed and committed the powers merely to take into account self-government or independence, according to the circumstances.

Regionalism struck one of the most discordant notes of the Conference. The United States found itself faced with a contradiction in its own policy. For fifteen years our government has been beating the drums of inter-American solidarity and understanding. Since the commencement of the war we have devoted ourselves to driving home the idea that there is such a thing as hemispheric defense and interests. We have convinced Latin America of this reality at almost the precise moment that we were called upon at San Francisco to defend the thesis of world jurisdiction and the supremacy of the world-wide organization over any local arrangement that might exist. There was no doubt that Secretary Stettinius was hard put to solve the dilemma.

Dumbarton Oaks stated that the regional arrangements could not come into effect without the authorization of the Security Council. At Mexico City, in the Declaration of Chapultepec, the American republics had agreed that automatic action should occur when any one of them suffered

an attack. Obviously, the two systems could not work simultaneously. The American republics were adamant on this point and refused absolutely to give in. Their real fear was that if they submitted every conflict to the Security Council, the veto of any one nation on that body would prevent action in the New World. As it stands now it is far from satisfactory. It states that the regional agreements stand; that action may be taken for defense if an attack occurs and that the Security Council shall be informed at once of the situation. The latter may take action if it sees fit upon the receipt of this information.

The American republics were particularly irritated by the fact that the dual alliances signed by the Soviet Union with France, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, were expressly excluded from the jurisdiction of the Security Council, thus permitting them to be used against Germany, for example, without any positive approval from the Security Council. While the theory is that the American regional arrangement will work by itself with the Security Council merely becoming informed, it is interesting to speculate how in actual practice this arbitrary system could possibly dovetail and both regional and world authority remain supreme at the same time.

The last point to be considered refers to the amendment of the Charter. No matter how rigid it may be

or how inflexible momentarily, if it can be amended or changed there is always hope for its natural evolution. A conference for reviewing the Charter may be called by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly and that of any seven members of the Security Council. This is, incidentally, one of the few cases in which it is specified that any seven members can act whether they include the Big Five or not. After ten years, if no such conference has been called, the proposal becomes a part of the agenda and may be considered. Proposed amendments as such may be vetoed by the Big Five.

#### NO ALTERNATIVE

What do we have then as a result of this rapid examination of the high points of the Charter? We have, as has been said before, an alliance, a concentration of power in the hands of the strong with the rest of the world as what might be called verbal onlookers. Our problem is not to decry the work of San Francisco as falling far short of the goal. It is not to pick flaws in the document and denounce it as vitiated by so many errors and deficiencies as to merit no support. Even if it is only ten percent of the possible 100 percent toward which we are striving, that ten percent is better than nothing—and the alternative to the present Charter is nothing at all. Let us reflect on the full meaning of that fact. If we do not make the present league work under the

Charter as drafted at San Francisco, there is not, for the moment, any alternative. We fall back into the absence of an international institution, into the mutual isolationism of the pre-1914 era, an intolerable situation today when the atom bomb has been added to the implements of war.

Even in relation to the great enigma of our time, the Soviet Union, the present Charter is better than nothing. We have to deal with Russia, because Russia is a part of our world. In dealing with her, which is better: to have contact by remote control from Washington to Moscow or London to Moscow, or to belong to the same organization, which can be improved, and force the Soviet representatives to

speak out to the world? It is infinitely better to have them present, face to face, because we may be able to work out an understanding. If they prove obdurate, unbending and impossibly dogmatic, then it is better that this occur where everyone can evaluate the reaction, see the results and recognize the reasons.

Just as the United States began its independent existence in the midst of regional strife, torn by state jealousies and misunderstandings, and evolved a well-knit system that has endured these many years, so, too, the new international order may be equally susceptible to modification and improvement, provided that the will is there to make it work.



### *Verify Sources*

That in the rush of routine daily work, a writer should let an error slip into his writing; that he should accept information without sufficiently verifying the source; that he may even give expression to a judgment that is unfair, may often be due to carelessness rather than to bad will. Yet, he should realize that such carelessness and such heedlessness, especially in times of grave crises, may too easily have serious consequences.

An editor, or writer, or speaker who is conscious of his lofty vocation and its responsibilities, is always alive to the obligation he has to the thousands or millions of people who may be strongly affected by the words to give them the truth, and nothing but the truth, as far as he has been able to ascertain it.—*Pope Pius XII to a Group of American Journalists.*

## Catholic Education and the Negro

REV. VINCENT A. MCQUADE, O.S.A., PH.D.

WE ARE in the midst of fast-moving political, social and economic changes, a dynamic period, one that is particularly suited for considering the position of the Negro in our American social patterns, and especially in his relationships to the Catholic Church and Catholic education. Acute socio-economic problems confront the American people within their own nation; complex and confused issues trouble our statesmen on the international scene. Recently we concluded fighting in a bloody and harsh war. We have contended for the superiority of a democratic form of government and fought to preserve what we like to call the American way of life. Even more, we believed that we were fighting the forces of tyranny and oppression and striving to uphold and defend man's inborn natural rights. Our position is weakened and our battle cries sound hollow and hypocritical to the extent to which we consider it necessary or expedient to exclude any portion of our population from participation in all our democratic rights and processes.

But what of the Negro? America's tenth man? Is he to continue suffering the same exploitation? Are Negroes to be continuously excluded from a full recognition of their rights? Segregation and discrimination in custom,

*An address delivered at the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Eastern Regional Unit, College and University Department, N.C.E.A., held in New York City on November 23rd and 24th, 1945.*

if not in law, have followed America's tenth man and throughout the nation there is no place in which he can be wholly secure from the blight of the color line. This is one of America's biggest and most pressing problems.

Various peoples from diverse sections of the world make up the population of these United States. Most differences are those of language and custom; as these diverse peoples become assimilated, lacking any physical badge of their origin, they become absorbed into the general population. One group, however, the Negroes, has physical appearances which give a "high visibility" and prevent this easy absorption.

The Negroes constitute the largest and most important minority racial group in the country. There are approximately thirteen and a quarter million Negroes in the United States (12,865,518 according to the census of 1940) and they make up 9.8 per cent of the total population. It would

be well, however, to remember that they have been identified with the nation from its earliest beginnings.<sup>1</sup>

In 1619, a year before the Mayflower landed at Plymouth Rock, the first permanent Negro settlers entered this country when twenty landed at Jamestown. The first settlers were probably indentured servants. Slavery as such was established when Sir John Yeamans brought Negroes from Barbados to South Carolina in 1671. Natural increase and further importations brought a growth in numbers and at the time of the first census in 1790 they constituted 19.3 per cent of the population (757,208 out of 3,929,000). The ensuing years have brought a great numeric increase, although each succeeding decade has shown a smaller proportion in the general population.<sup>2</sup>

Slavery took a firm hold in the South, aided perhaps by an economy which made their use profitable. The Emancipation Proclamation brought a theoretic freedom, and while some progress has been achieved, many difficult problems remain. The large majority of Negroes still reside in the South. According to the 1940 census distribution, 9,904,619 or 77 per cent were in the South; 2,790,193 or 21.7 per cent were in the North; and

170,706 or 1.3 per cent were in the West, with the large majority of this group in California.<sup>3</sup> The urban trend of the Negro group has lagged behind the country as a whole; in 1940, 51.1 per cent were rural and 48.5 per cent urban. In the North they are predominantly city dwellers and 88 per cent in this region are classified as urban.

#### PREJUDICE AND DISCRIMINATION

Since emancipation, the passing years have brought many improvements and considerable progress. However, they have lagged far behind the majority group in almost every phase of life. In particular, education has been a major limiting factor. In those States providing separate educational facilities, great differences exist between those provided for whites and those provided for Negroes. (Seventeen States and the District of Columbia provide segregation.) When racial segregation is not provided by law, the blighting hand of prejudice and discrimination prevent a full utilization of all available facilities. A more complete analysis of this question may prove illuminating.

Illiteracy is more prevalent among Negroes than among other groups, is

<sup>1</sup> History shows that they played a prominent role in the early discoveries. It is probable that a Negro piloted one of Columbus ships on his first and third voyage. Negroes accompanied Balboa, Cortez, Pizarro and De Soto on their expeditions to this continent. They also aided in the discovery of the Southwest and were among the first settlers in Alabama, Florida and Louisiana.

<sup>2</sup> In 1790, they constituted 19.3 per cent of the total population; in 1830, 18.1 per cent; 1870, 13.5 per cent; 1930, 9.7 per cent; 1940, 9.8 per cent.

<sup>3</sup> The South is made up of the South Atlantic, East South Central and West South Central States; the North is made up of New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central and West North Central States; the West is made up of the Mountain and Pacific States.



much higher in the South than in other regions of the country and it is much more prevalent among Negroes of the South than among other groups. According to one study of Army personnel: "Analysis of fourteen months of data (23 August 1943 through 31 October 1944) reveals that proportionately eight times as many Negroes as Whites entering the Army were classified as grade V (equivalent of slow-learning) or illiterate and were sent for special training."<sup>4</sup>

In 1940, 41.3 per cent of the Negroes completed less than five years of schooling; the corresponding figure for whites is 13.5 per cent. Likewise, a noticeably smaller percentage have completed high school and college.<sup>5</sup> Qualitative study of Negro educational facilities likewise reveals discrepancies. In a few States wherein segregation prevails, the facilities are almost equal (notably the District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, etc.); the majority, however, provide a shorter school term, a larger number of students per teacher, poorly prepared and low salaries for the teachers, a lower average number of students in daily attendance, run-down facilities and a much lower per capita expenditure.

In eleven southern States, the aver-

age public school expenditure per white pupil during 1941-42 school year was \$68.04. The average per Negro pupil was \$26.59.<sup>6</sup> In passing, it is interesting to observe that this discrimination extends to libraries, a most important tool in education. In 1938, "... out of 744 library service units in the South (excluding those of the W.P.A.) only 99 gave service to Negroes. In other words, 645 public libraries which were open for service gave none to Negroes."<sup>7</sup> In other words, public education is available for Negroes, but it is inferior and lower in quality than the education available for whites.

Higher education is likewise available but the same general pattern prevails. By far, the large majority attend the segregated colleges of the South. (In 1940, there were 118 institutions, 36 publicly controlled and 82 privately controlled, with an estimated enrollment of 48,614; an additional 2,297 were enrolled in Northern institutions.) In general, because of their earlier schooling, these students do not measure up to the average of the country. The large number of Negro college students is drawn from the urban schools (including 34 per cent recruited from Northern and border States for South-

<sup>4</sup> U. S. Office of Education, "Education for Victory," Vol. 3, No. 20, April 20, 1945, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> The figures are as follows: 4.1 per cent of the Negroes have completed high school and 1.2 per cent have completed college. The corresponding figures for whites are: 16.6 per cent have completed high schools and 5.4 per cent have completed college.

<sup>6</sup> See, *America*, October 27, 1945; also U. S. Office of Education, "Statistics of State School Systems, 1939-40 and 1941-42."

<sup>7</sup> According to a more recent unpublished survey made by the School of Library Service of Atlanta University, the number of libraries giving service to Negroes has increased from 99 to 121. E. A. Gleason, "Facing the Dilemma of Public Library Service for Negroes", *Library Quarterly*, Vol. XV, No. 4, October 1945, p. 341.



ern Negro colleges). They are drawn from a low socio-economic group. (The median reported familial income — income of parents — among seniors is \$1,048 per year and among freshmen, \$852.00 per year.)

Most of these students must contribute to their own support and the entering freshmen in institutions for the higher education of Negroes attain low rank on standardized psychological and achievement examinations. On the American Council of Educational Psychological Examination, the median gross score was the 4th percentile; on Cooperative English Test, median gross score was the 4th percentile. When their education is completed, the same results follow, for seniors attain low rank on standardized achievement examinations. (In the Cooperative General Culture Test, the median gross score stood at the tenth percentile of the test norms.)

Briefly we might summarize our discussion thus far in the following terms. Great advances have been made in the past eighty years. Greater progress has been prevented because of the existing patterns of segregation, the discrimination to which the Negroes are subjected, and the opposition they encounter in striving to raise their social-economic level of living.

It is said that Negroes are a deeply religious group. I believe they are. In their lives, the role of the Church is unique: it is not merely a place of religious worship but the very center

of Negro social life. In general, it assumes an important place since it is one institution where the black man can find avenues of self-expression and enterprise free from the white man's direct intrusion and control. The number of Catholic Negroes, however, is distressingly small. Within the general white population of the country, out of some 125 million people, there are about 24 million Catholics. (23,963,671, according to the *Catholic Directory*.) Roughly this means that one out of every five white persons in the country is a Catholic. (Actually 1:5.3.) There are around 13 million Negroes, and the Negro is America's *tenth man*, but only 315,791 Negro Catholics, or one out of every 42 Negro persons is a Catholic. Apart from the reasons which might explain this distribution, we have here a great need to preach the Gospel and bring Christ to the multitudes. If we would do this effectively, we would wisely use our Catholic educational system to assist in this worthy cause.

#### UNDERSTANDING AND OPPORTUNITIES

There are two areas in which Catholic institutions of higher education can do special service: 1. Provide a better understanding of the race relations question; 2. Provide wider opportunities for Negro Catholics to attend our Catholic institutions and obtain the advantages of a Catholic education.

The tension and unrest in our post-war world has aroused an interest among educators in the question of race relations. To bring a clear grasp of this question to Catholic students, all available scientific evidence should be utilized. Thus, it would be well for all to understand clearly that there is not one bit of evidence to show that one race is superior to another in innate abilities; that the learning plateau of Negroes is not different from that of whites; that all Negroes do not steal; that Negroes are not naturally immoral, etc. Negroes have been forced to live in some of the worst slum areas and in general have not been given the advantages of a good environment.

Catholic education should not stop here, however, for the cogent and dynamic arguments of religion should be emphasized. Christ died for all men: white and black, good and bad, saints and sinners; the Precious Blood was shed for all. We are all members of the Mystical Body and our advantages flow from that new birth and adoption into the household of God, and not from the eminence of our race. "For as many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek: there is neither bond nor free: there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus."<sup>8</sup> Christianity first affirmed the real and universal brotherhood of

all men of whatever race and condition. Once these truths are fully grasped, racial prejudice should at least decline, if not disappear entirely among Catholics.

However, if our discussions are to bear fruit, we ourselves, in our institutions, must practice what we preach. Otherwise, our actions will thunder so loudly that none will be able to hear what we say. This brings us to our second point: provide opportunities for Negro Catholics to attend our Catholic colleges.

Educationally, we have developed a system of which we may be justly proud. It has been taking care of our white Catholics and this is especially true of our institutions of higher education. There are two institutions of collegiate grade, conducted under Catholic auspices, especially for Negroes. Both of these institutions are doing notable work. But what are we doing in our own institutions? Do we draw the color line? Are we doing our utmost to give the advantages of a Catholic college education to our Negro Catholics?

Probably most, if not all, can say that they do not draw a color line. One, maybe two or three Negroes are now in attendance or have graduated in the past. It is not enough. A single robin does not make a spring nor does a sporadic student of color remove the line of discrimination. It may be said that all colored students applying are admitted, if they meet our

<sup>8</sup> Gal. III—27, 28.

admissions standards. But even this is not enough. It may fulfil the demands of justice. I shall not argue the point. I will say that, to my way of thinking, it does not fulfil the demands of charity—the charity that demands giving until it hurts. The charity we should practice if we would treat the Negro in a truly Christian manner.

#### ESTABLISH SCHOLARSHIPS

Catholic Negroes are not especially numerous in our Northern areas. Within the territorial limits of the Eastern Regional Unit, there are approximately 99,738 Negro Catholics.<sup>9</sup> For the most part, however, they cannot avail themselves of a Catholic college education because they lack the financial means.<sup>10</sup> Most Negroes unfortunately are members of our lowest income groups. If we would be truly charitable, we will make it possible for some to attend our institutions by establishing at least one scholarship for a Catholic Negro, and this is the proposal that I would entreat all our institutions to follow. In brief, let each institution set up at least one scholarship for a Catholic Negro and provide real opportunity for the leaven of Catholicism to do its work. If Catholic education is a vital force in our social, political

and religious life, we will readily realize the crying need and necessity to bring its advantages to one of the most underprivileged and handicapped groups in the country—Negroes.

It may be said that they have equal opportunity to win a competitive scholarship. Within limits, this is true and, in an odd case, it takes place. For the most part, it is improbable and an unlikely happening. They are members of a low income group, they lack the normal cultural advantages found in a normal home, their test scores in normal Freshman college examinations reflect these disadvantages, and finally, the discrimination to which they are subjected stifles initiative.

The Negro is in America to stay. In the past, he has encountered frustration, discrimination and contempt. Neither one of these proposals will answer the problems providing an immediate solution. They seem to me to be steps in the right direction and will accomplish more than is readily visible. Various radical philosophies have made inroads among the Negroes and emphasis on the brotherhood of man has been the strongest attraction drawing them to un-American ideals. The true brotherhood of man must be founded on the Father-

<sup>9</sup> Negro Catholics in this area are distributed among the following dioceses: Albany, 300; Baltimore-Washington, 43,922; Brooklyn, 15,000; Buffalo, 1,970; Camden, 941; Newark, 7,500; New York, 18,000; Philadelphia, 9,200; Pittsburgh, 1,200; Trenton, 500; Wilmington, 1,205.

<sup>10</sup> It is significant to observe that in their appeal in behalf of the Negro and Indian Missions, the Bishops at the head of the Commission for Catholic Missions Among Colored People and the Indians speak of the impoverished conditions and their low financial condition.

hood of God, if it is to be meaningful. In any case, it loses all meaning unless it is practiced.

The saga of the Negro in America is a sad tale of suffering due to neglect to apply the elementary principles of Christianity. Let us do our part by applying the charity of Christ. In closing, we might keep in mind the words of Pope Pius XI: "It was Christianity that first affirmed the real and universal brotherhood of all men of whatever race and condition. This doctrine she practiced

and proclaimed by a method, and with an amplitude and conviction unknown to preceding centuries; and with it she patiently contributed to the abolition of slavery. Not bloody revolution, but the inner force of her teaching made the proud Roman matron see in her slave a sister in Christ." (*Atheistic Communism*) Christianity is still a potent force, but its might will be felt only if practiced toward all men, including Negroes. Up to this time, to our shame, we have failed to do this.

### *Pedagogy of Feasts*

For people are instructed in the truths of faith and brought to appreciate the inner joys of religion far more effectually by the annual celebration of our sacred mysteries than by any official pronouncement of the teaching of the Church. Such pronouncements usually reach only a few and the more learned among the faithful: feasts reach them all. The Church's teaching affects the mind primarily: her feasts affect both mind and heart and have a salutary effect upon the whole of man's nature.—*Pope Pius XI in QUAS PRIMAS.*

#### THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge    EXECUTIVE EDITOR: Benjamin L. Masse  
With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York 25, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy    BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll  
BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.